THE CASE OF

ISMAIL IBRAHIM PATEL

(HARRIS HAMMAM)

A Pattern of Dishonesty & Poor Comprehension

CONTENTS

Introduction....3

Questions by HS to HH....4

Questions by HH to HS....63

Appendices....106

Exposing Ismail Ibrahim's Poor Comprehension/Dishonesty....107

More Dishonesty from Ismail Ibrahim/Harris Hammam....110

Ismail Ibrahim Fabricating a False Narrative based on a Complete Misreading....112

INTRODUCTION

The following is a lengthy discussion from 2014 on the now defunct "Islamic Awakening" forum, between a certain infamous Ismail Ibrahim Patel (username "Harris Hammam") and another individual named Hasan Saleem. The discussion is no longer available online due to the forum having been deactivated, but fortunately someone had it saved in their files. The purpose of publishing this is to highlight the stark ignorance, major comprehension problems, and dishonesty of "Harris Hammam", who is wrongly perceived by some as being an intelligent person. This is one of the rare cases where there has actually been a lengthy back and forth between him and someone else publicly challenging him on his views, and it really exposes his ignorance and poor comprehension. Appended to the forum discussion are some additional posts that were written highlighting his poor comprehension and dishonesty.

QUESTIONS BY HS TO HH

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> "Focus on humans for now. How on earth is the human eye able to see something that is not in a direction? How can Ash`aris claim it is logical that the human eye sees something that is not in front of you?
>
> Logic dictates that Ru'yah in Jannah is to be denied, just like the Mu`tazilite said, but the Ash`aris are masters of self-contradiction by affirming Ru'yah one the one hand and denying direction from the human eye on the other.
>
> Laymen believe in the Ru'yah of Allah, with all the people of Jannah looking in one direction (not multiple directions, or no direction). I wonder what botox procedure is used by the Ash`aris to cleanse the minds of ordinary Muslims from this image of the people of Jannah looking in one direction. Have Ash`aris ever warned laymen that this is Kufr in the Ash`ari creed? When laymen talk about Ru'yah in their Tablighi lectures or in their homes, nobody warns them that 'oh

> you must believe in a Ru'yah that is void of direction otherwise you would have done Kufr'.
>
> If the title of this thread is true, then the equal opposite is even more true: The dangerous implications of denying a direction from Allah, as highlighted in the Ru'yah mas'alah.
>
> For a millennium, Ash`aris and the creed of the simple layman have been at odds. Ash`aris messed up when the delved in the Jihah issue. They should have remained silent like laymen do and not speak about it. Instead, they are forced to do Tabdi` on the majority of the Ummah or deny the Ru'yah on its apparent meaning - both of which are suicidal as each other.
>
> And that is the reason why you'll never hear an Ash`ari talk about Ru'yah in a polemic, unless forced to do so.
>
> To sidestep this, some Ash`aris claim that Allah will create a faculty in the people of Jannah that will be able to perceive things that are not in a direction! The Sixth Sense, literally. So' you now must believe in Bruce Willis according to these Ash`ari numpties.

Imam Tahawi said quoting from the Salaf:

والرؤية حق لأهل الجنة بغير إحاطة ولا كيفية

No kayfiyyah: i.e., no jihah, muqabalah, masafah etc.

And he said:

ومن لم يتوق النفي والتشبيه زل ولم يصب التنزيه فإن ربنا جل وعلا موصوف بصفات الوحدانية منعوت بنعوت الفردانية ليس في معناه أحد من البرية تعالى الله عن الحدود والغايات والأركان والأعضاء والأدوات، لا تحويه الجهات الست كسائر المبتدعات

This clearly supports the Sunni (Ash'ari) view. Allah is nothing like His creation. Jihah, muqabalah, masafah - which for you are necessities of ru'yah - are qualities of creation. Hence, Sunnis negate them for Allah; while at the same time they affirm ru'yah and negate these kayfiyyat.

Imam al-Isma'ili (b 277), famous hadith scholar author of the Mustakhraj, said narrating from the imams of hadith from the Salaf:

ويعتقدون جواز الرؤية من العباد المتقين لله عز وجل فى القيامة دون الدنيا...وذلك من غير اعتقاد التجسيم فى الله عز وجل ولا التحديد له ولكن يرونه جل وعز بأعينهم على ما يشاء هو بلا كيف

No tajsim, no hadd, no kayf - but however Allah wishes. Isma'ili also denied limbs, parts and anything like creation for Allah in the same book I'tiqad A'immatil Hadith:

ولا يعتقد فيه (الله) الأعضاء والجوارح ولا الطول والعرض والغلظ والدقة ونحو هذا مما يكون مثله فى الخلق]

Harris Hammam:

I asked how it is logical in the Ash`ari creed for a human eye to look at something that is in no direction. For a creed that claims to be in tandem with reason, this has not been satisfactorily answered over 1000 years.

Secondly, not delving into Kayfiyyah means Ru'yah is believed in as it is, not by adding extra articles such as:

فيرى لا في مكان ولا على جهة من مقابلة أو اتصال شعاع أو ثبوت مسافة بين الرائي وبين الله تعالى وغير ذلك من المعاني التي هي من أمارات الحدث

which is pretty much standard in Maturidi texts.

This type of Kalami rhetoric in the Ru'yah is what al-Tahawi was negating, but the Maturidis and Ash`aris violate this in their discourses and add all of the above. And if this was so critical, why aren't the laymen warned away from believing in all this, since the Zahir of Ru'yah is Kufr according to Kalami logic.

This Ru'yah is along with Allah being Muhit (محيط), not Muhat (محاط). Allah is the Encompasser, not encompassed. The people of Jannah will not encompass Allah even after seeing Him. The reason why this was negated by al-Tahawi was that there are two types of Ru'yah:

1) One where there is إحاطة where the onlooker encompasses the seen entity, such as a man purchasing a food

2) One where there is no إحاطة, and this is the Ru'yah of the people in Jannah, looking at Allah `Azza Wa-Jall - as is established by the Sifah of Allah known as إحاطة

In other words, he was establishing that Allah remains محيط during and after the Ru'yah, and will never be محاط, Subhanah Wa-Ta`ala.

But let's look away from this academic discussion and go straight to the litmus test. Ask an ordinary Muslim layman this question: When the people of Jannah will behold Allah, will Allah be in front of their eyes, or in no place/direction?

I think their answer will be the Sunni one, not an Ash`ari one.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Secondly, not delving into Kayfiyyah means Ru'yah is believed in as it is, not by adding extra articles such as:
>
> فيرى لا في مكان ولا على جهة من مقابلة أو اتصال شعاع أو ثبوت مسافة بين الرائي وبين الله تعالى وغير ذلك من المعاني التي هي من أمارات الحدث
>
> which is pretty much standard in Maturidi texts.
>
> This type of Kalami rhetoric in the Ru'yah is what al-Tahawi was negating

According to your skewed ta'wil. To me, Tahawi, Isma'ili and the "standard" Maturidi (Sunni) texts are saying the same thing, as is clear to anyone reading from a neutral perspective. Tahawi doesn't say "not delving into kayfiyyah" as you distorted it, but that there is no kayfiyyah just like there is no ihatah. Meaning, there is no jihah, masafah etc.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> I asked how it is logical in the Ash`ari creed for a human eye to look at something that is in no direction. For a creed that claims to be in tandem with reason, this has not been satisfactorily answered over 1000 years.

Have you read all Ash'ari and Maturidi texts over 1000 years to make this claim?! The ru'yah of Allah in Jannah is a heightened perception of Allah sensed with the eyes. The Sunni Aqidah books draw an analogy with having 'ilm of Allah, which we humans can have despite Allah being totally unlike His creation. Similarly, the ru'yah is a higher level of perception which will be experienced by our eyes. This does not mean confining Allah to a direction,

distance, place or whatever else you believe is necessary for Allah (تعالى الله عن ذلك علوا كبيرا).

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> But let's look away from this academic discussion and go straight to the litmus test. Ask an ordinary Muslim layman this question: When the people of Jannah will behold Allah, will Allah be in front of their eyes, or in no place/direction?

Since when did the belief of laymen become the litmus test for 'aqidah?!

Harris Hammam:

There is a traditional disagreement between Ash`aris and Atharis on how to approach the Ru'yah matter, so very briefly:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> According to your skewed ta'wil. To me, Tahawi, Isma'ili and the "standard" Maturidi (Sunni) texts are saying the same thing, as is clear to anyone reading from a neutral perspective.

I have to disagree. Firstly, I don't consider Imam al-Tahawi to be on the side of the Mutakallimun in Ru'yah. His statement without Ihatah in my estimation means without becoming Muhat by the Ru'yah (i.e., still maintains His attribute of being Muhit during and after Ru'yah), and without Kayfiyyah i.e., we do not delve into the Kayfiyyah, as Imam Malik said that the Kayfiyyah is Majhul. All these extra articles added by the Mutakallimun are a product of Kalam being read into the Nusus.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Tahawi doesn't say "not delving into kayfiyyah" as you distorted it, but that there is no kayfiyyah just like there is no ihatah. Meaning, there is no jihah, masafah etc.

I disagree with your claim that Kayfiyyah = Jihah/Masafah. Kayfiyyah means modality. There is a modality but we don't know how it will be achieved, which in this case is the Ru'yah. This is what is meant by بلا كيف. The same has been mentioned by the Salaf after mentioning some attributes the Mutakallimun like the Jahmis and Mu`tazilites (and by extension the Ash`aris and Maturidis) did Ta`til of. What is meant by بلا كيف is without [delving into] modality.

According to your claim of Kayfiyyah = Jihah/Masafah, when Imam Malik was speaking on Istiwa and said والكيف مجهول, your interpretation would be والجهة مجهولة. This is Batil.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Have you read all Ash'ari and Maturidi texts over 1000 years to make this claim?! The ru'yah of Allah in Jannah is a heightened perception of Allah sensed with the eyes.

No, I haven't read ever Ash`ari book out there, but "heightened perception of Allah sensed with the eyes"? Nice words, but I'm curious how has that been expressed in the Arabic texts of Ash`ari/Maturidi theology.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> The Sunni Aqidah books draw an analogy with having 'ilm of Allah, which we humans can have despite Allah being totally unlike His creation. Similarly, the ru'yah

> is a higher level of perception which will be experienced by our eyes.

Sorry but I didn't understand.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> This does not mean confining Allah to a direction, distance, place or whatever else you believe is necessary for Allah (تعالى الله عن ذلك علوا كبيرا).

You are putting words in my mouth. I was strictly speaking in the context of the people of Jannah - wasn't talking about Allah, regarding whom we remain silent from such ambiguous terms.

You have failed to provide a satisfactory answer the illogical nature in the Ash`ari argument that the human eye will be able to see a being that is in no direction. "Heightened perception with the eyes" just doesn't cut it, nor is it the Zahir of Ru'yah.

إلى ربها ناظرة is quite clear, but I know Ash`aris provide long essays on a workaround of this verse to save their creed, featuring some of the most ridiculous Ta'wils available.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Since when did the belief of laymen become the litmus test for 'aqidah?!

Since the Ash`aris implicitly declared them all to be ignorant innovators for their belief that Allah will be in front of the people of Jannah when they will be beholding their Lord. That is why Ibn Rushd, though not being an Athari, slammed the Ash`aris for having an evidently self-contradictory belief on the matter, via Ibn Taymiyyah's Dar':

وأما الأشعرية فراموا الجمع بين الاعتقادين أعني بين انتفاء الجسمية وبين جواز الرؤية لما ليس بجسم بالحس فعسر ذلك عليهم ولجأوا في ذلك إلى حجج سوفسطائية مموهة

What Ibn Rushd meant was that your verbal acrobatic "heightened perception of Allah sensed with the eyes", is based on - as he says - حجج سوفسطائية مموهة. No offence. And that is why Sayyid Sulayman Nadwi also couldn't believe the nonsensical stuff coming out of the Ash`ari camp. In his book on `Aqidah, he said:

> For example, on one hand we see these Ahl 'l-Kalam agreed with the Mu'tazilites in that Allah has no limbs, and they did Ta'weel in those places where face and hand have been mentioned. On the other hand, they agreed with the Zahiris in that Allah shall be seen. The result of this is that they failed to side with the Sunnis, nor were they able to side with the Philosophers. The Ahl 'l-Kalam had to start denying in known things by saying that "to see something needs the seen thing to be a body, positioned, coloured, in front of the eyes, with a distance etc. is not necessary".

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> There is a traditional disagreement between Ash`aris and Atharis on how to approach the Ru'yah matter

I regard Tahawi, Isma'ili, Bayhaqi etc. as true Atharis (those who follow Athar), and they agree with Ash'aris.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> His statement without Ihatah in my estimation means without becoming Muhat by the Ru'yah (i.e., still maintains His attribute of being Muhit during and after Ru'yah), and without Kayfiyyah i.e., we do not delve into the Kayfiyyah, as Imam Malik said that the Kayfiyyah is Majhul. All these extra articles added by

> the Mutakallimun are a product of Kalam being read into the Nusus.

Amazing, you talk about mutakallimun reading kalam into nusus, yet you do the same with Imam Tahawi's statement - reading your prejudiced views into Imam Tahawi's clear statement.

In "bighayr ihaatah", you and I both agree he is negating ihaatah, just as you said. But in bila kayfiyyah which is ma'tuf on bighayr ihaatah you do some farfetched ta'wil of "not delving into". I'm afraid that is tahreef of his words. wa la kayfiyyah means just that - there is **no** kayfiyyah, no jihah etc. **just as** there is no ihaatah.

Imam Malik's more famous statement is "kayf ghayr ma'qul" and that is more authentic from him. As for "kayf majhul" there is also a Sunni tawjih for that, that is to interpret "kayf" as meaning "reality" (haqiqah). So, his statement means istiwa happened as Allah said in His Book but its reality is unknown. This is the very essence of the madhhab of tafwid of the Salaf.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Kayfiyyah means modality. There is a modality but we don't know how it will be achieved, which in this case is the Ru'yah. This is what is meant by بلا كيف.

This is what you believe but not what Imam al-Tahawi said. Please do not do tahreef of his words.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> According to your claim of Kayfiyyah = Jihah/Masafah, when Imam Malik was speaking on Istiwa and said والكيف مجهول, your interpretation would be والجهة مجهولة. This is Batil.

I have explained what Imam Malik meant. In the more authentic version of ghayr ma'qul, kayf means modality; if it is kayf majhul it means haqiqah.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> No. I haven't read ever Ash`ari book out there, but "heightened perception of Allah sensed with the eyes"? Nice words, but I'm curious how has that been expressed in the Arabic texts of Ash`ari/Maturidi theology.

The Ash'aris make an analogy of it with having knowledge of Allah as I mentioned, and ru'yah is a form of perception involving the eyes. That is all. It does not need the kayfiyyah that you imagine. As Ibn al-Jawzi said, mujassimah think only in terms of hiss (tangible/sense). But Allah is far beyond comparison or qiyas with tangible things.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Sorry but I didn't understand.

It's quite clear. Take off the hiss glasses, and it is clear.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> You are putting words in my mouth. I was strictly speaking in the context of the people of Jannah - wasn't talking about Allah, regarding whom we remain silent from such ambiguous terms.

So, when the people of Jannah look at Allah, will it be with direction, opposition (muqabalah) and physical distance between seer and seen?

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> You have failed to provide a satisfactory answer the illogical nature in the Ash`ari argument that the human eye will be able to see a being that is in no direction. "Heightened perception with the eyes" just doesn't cut it, nor is it the Zahir of Ru'yah.

Ru'yah means perception with the eyes, idrak with 'aynayn (or nazr). The "how" of this for Allah is ineffable. But it is without any kayfiyyat, jihah etc. What is the logical contradiction in that? Why is it mustaheel?

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> That is why Ibn Rushd, though not being an Athari, slammed the Ash`aris for having an evidently self-contradictory belief on the matter, via Ibn Taymiyyah's Dar'

Proving quite clearly that pseudo-Atharis have more in common with Faylasufs than the madhhab of the Salaf. Ash'aris follow the Salaf not Faylasufs. And the Salaf like those Imam Isma'ili quoted from **denied** jism and yet **affirmed** ruyah (which you claim is a contradiction). You with the Faylasufs may decide to call it "illogical", but the whole enterprise of Sunni Kalam was defence of the 'aqidah of Salaf.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> or example, on one hand we see these Ahl 'l-Kalam agreed with the Mu'tazilites in that Allah has no limbs, and they did Ta'weel in those places where face and hand have been mentioned.

What batil is this? You know Imam Tahawi quoting from the Salaf negated limbs. You know Isma'ili quoting from the Salaf negated

limbs. How did the Sunni Mutakallimun imitate the Mu'tazilah in this?! Face and hand literally mean limbs. If you move them away from the literal meaning, that may technically be regarded as taweel. So, the Salaf too did taweel in this sense.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> On the other hand, they agreed with the Zahiris in that Allah shall be seen. The result of this is that they failed to side with the Sunnis, nor were they able to side with the Philosophers.

Again more batil. They did not side with Zahiris on seeing Allah. They sided with the Salaf and Ahlus Sunnah.

Harris Hammam:

Jazakallah for your remarks. This is getting longer and longer, so I'll get back to you soon insha'allah.

Just two small notes:

1. Quoting Ibn Rushd's valid argument against Ash`aris doesn't make Ibn Taymiyyah a supporter of philosophers. This is just a cheap shot and ridiculous argument. Zahid al-Kawthari edited Maimonides's work - does that make Maturidis closer to the Jews?

2.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Sayyid Sulayman Nadwi:]
>
> > For example, on one hand we see these Ahl 'l-Kalam agreed with the Mu'tazilites in that Allah has no limbs, and they did Ta'weel in those places where face and hand have been mentioned.

> What batil is this? You know Imam Tahawi quoting from the Salaf negated limbs. You know Isma'ili quoting from the Salaf negated limbs. How did the Sunni Mutakallimun imitate the Mu'tazilah in this?! Face and hand literally mean limbs. If you move them away from the literal meaning, that may technically be regarded as taweel. So, the Salaf too did taweel in this sense.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Sayyid Sulayman Nadwi:]
>
> > On the other hand, they agreed with the Zahiris in that Allah shall be seen. The result of this is that they failed to side with the Sunnis, nor were they able to side with the Philosophers.
>
> Again more batil. They did not side with Zahiris on seeing Allah. They sided with the Salaf and Ahlus Sunnah.

I was quoting Sayyid Sulayman Nadwi there. You may not like the reality but the truth does sometimes hurt.

Just like the truth that every Muslim layman on this planet who knows about the Ru'yah of Allah does not subscribe to articles of faith such as:

فيرى لا في مكان ولا على جهة من مقابلة أو اتصال شعاع أو ثبوت مسافة بين الرائي وبين الله تعالى وغير ذلك من المعاني التي هي من أمارات الحدث

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Imam Malik's more famous statement is "kayf ghayr ma'qul" and that is more authentic from him. As for "kayf majhul" there is also a Sunni tawjih for that, that is to interpret "kayf" as meaning "reality" (haqiqah). So, his statement means istiwa happened as Allah said in His Book but its reality is unknown. This is the very essence of the madhhab of tafwid of the Salaf.

Just on this point, another clearer wording of Imam Malik's statement is "wa kayf 'anhu marfoo'" (narrated by Bayhaqi with a jayyid sanad according to Hafiz Asqalani) which is similar to "ghayr ma'qool." This also clearly agrees with what Imam al-Tahawi said.

I think HH should try to read Imam Tahawi's 'Aqidah from an unprejudiced pov. It is clear whose "side" he is on. He clearly negates limbs and parts, boundaries and directions, for Allah, in a pure statement on tanzeeh, and he clearly negates kayfiyyah for ru'yah. And it appears you are subtly hinting that you need Ibn Abil Izz's commentary to force Tahawi's creed on your "side". For Sunnis, however, we are not in need of doing tahreef of his words.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Take a simple look at another one of IT's works, where he does actually talk about the term Jism in relation to Allah from aTaqriri viewpoint i.e., establishing his own position on the term vis-a-vis Allah.

I will insha Allah take a look at his Sharh Hadith al-Nuzul and what he has to say about his belief on Jism.

But for now, I want to ask you about a passage from another of his Taqriri books: Risalat al-Tadmuriyya, in which he is describing his belief, and it is not technically a reply to anyone. IT mentions an important principle in this book (which he also does in other books including Bayan al-Talbis). Here it is (from page 20 onwards):

وذلك أنه قد عُلم بضرورة العقل أنه لا بد من موجود قديم غني عما سواه، إذ نحن نشاهد حدوث المحدثات كالحيوان والمعدن والنبات، والحادث ممكن ليس بواجب ولا ممتنع، وقد عُلم بالاضطرار أن المحدَث لا بد له من محدِث، والممكن لا بد له من واجب، كما قال تعالى: {أَمْ خُلِقُوا مِنْ غَيْرِ شَيْءٍ أَمْ هُمُ الْخَالِقُونَ} ، فإذا لم يكونوا خلقوا من غير خالق ولا هم الخالقون لأنفسهم تعين أن لهم خالقا خلقهم.

وإذا كان من المعلوم بالضرورة أن في الوجود ما هو قديم واجب بنفسه، وما هو مُحْدَث ممكن، يقبل الوجود والعدم، **فمعلوم أن هذا موجود وهذا موجود ولا يلزم من اتفاقهما في مسمى «الوجود» أن يكون وجود هذا مثل وجود هذا، بل وجود هذا يخصّه ووجود هذا يخصه، واتفاقهما في اسم عام لا يقتضي تماثلهما في مسمى ذلك الاسم عند الاضافة والتقييد والتخصيص** ولا في غيره، فلا يقول عاقل - إذا قيل: إن العرش شيء موجود وإن البعوض شيء موجود - إن هذا مثل هذا لاتفاقهما في مسمى «الشيء«

و «الوجود» ، لأنه ليس في الخارج شيء موجود غيرهما يشتركان فيه، بل الذهن يأخذ معنى مشتركا كليا هو مسمى الاسم المطلق، وإذا قيل: هذا موجود وهذا موجود، فوجود كلّ منهما يخصه لا يشركه فيه غيره، مع أن الاسم حقيقة في كل منهما.

ولهذا سمى الله نفسه بأسماء وسمّى صفاته بأسماء، فكانت تلك الأسماء مختصة به إذا أضيفت إليه لا يشركه فيها غيره، وسمّى بعض مخلوقاته بأسماء مختصة بهم مضافة إليهم توافق تلك الأسماء إذا قطعت عن الإضافة والتخصيص، ولم يلزم من اتفاق الاسمين تماثل مسماهما واتحاده عند الإطلاق والتجريد عن الإضافة والتخصيص، لا اتفاقهما، ولا تماثل المسمى عند الإضافة والتخصيص، فضلا عن أن يتحد مسماهما عند الإضافة والتخصيص.

فقد سمّى الله نفسه حيًّا، فقال: {اللَّهُ لاَ إِلَهَ إِلاَّ هُوَ الْحَيُّ الْقَيُّومُ} وسمّى بعض عباده حيًا، فقال: {يُخْرِجُ الْحَيَّ مِنَ الْمَيِّتِ وَيُخْرِجُ الْمَيِّتَ مِنَ الْحَيِّ} وليس هذا الحيّ مثل هذا الحي، لأن قوله {الْحَيُّ} اسم لله مختص به، وقوله {يُخْرِجُ الْحَيَّ مِنَ الْمَيِّتِ} اسم للحي المخلوق مختص به، وإنما يتفقان إذا أُطلقا وجُرِّدا عن التخصيص، **ولكن ليس للمطلق مسمّى موجود في الخارج، ولكن العقل يفهم من المطلق قدرًا مشتركا بين المسميين، وعند الاختصاص يقيّد ذلك بما يتميز به الخالق عن المخلوق، والمخلوق عن الخالق.**

ولا بدّ من هذا في جميع أسماء الله وصفاته، يُفهم منها ما دلّ عليه الاسم بالمواطأة والاتفاق، وما دلّ عليه بالإضافة والاختصاص، المانعة من مشاركة المخلوق للخالق في شيء من خصائصه سبحانه وتعالى.

Please, have a careful read of this passage. I'm sure you feel this passage is strongly in favour of Ibn Taymiyyah's tanzeeh.

But it is this very important principle of IT which I (and others) feel is the very basis of IT's tajsim/tashbih. The same principle is reiterated by others of IT's followers, e.g., Ibn Uthaymin in his Fatawa.

The principle which IT is asserting is that all of the names and attributes of Allah have some basic meaning. The basic meaning is the "qadr mushtarak" (shared aspect) between all objects possessing that attribute. For example, "mawjud" (existing) has a basic meaning of being in existence. That basic meaning applies to all things that possess that attribute. However, just because two things possess this same attribute, it does not mean those attributes are the same in both in all respects. Rather, when the attribute applies to one, it has a distinction that differentiates it from the other. So, although Allah and creation both share in the property of "wujud", this is only a shared meaning existing in the mind, as once you apply it to Allah and to creation, the reality is completely different. (To some extent, Ash'aris would agree with this, but the only reason for

that is "wujud" is not a property that resides in the being or essence; it is a word describing the very being of something).

IT applies this principle to **all** attributes.

Now, my question to you is:

1. Firstly, do you accept this principle outlined by IT?

2. And, secondly, if you do: What is the "shared meaning" of "eye" which is common between Allah and creation? How do you determine this "shared meaning"? In other words, what is the basic meaning of "eye" which must be affirmed, and which every believer must accept for Allah?

Please be clear in your answers, and please don't answer with more questions unless they relate directly to this question (and not what you presume to be my belief).

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> 1. Firstly, do you accept this principle outlined by IT?

Yes.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> 2. And, secondly, if you do: What is the "shared meaning" of "eye" which is common between Allah and creation? How do you determine this "shared meaning"? In other words, what is the basic meaning of "eye" which must be affirmed, and which every believer must accept for Allah?

It is not necessary to know the exact details of the shared aspects. It is not even necessary to express them, or to be able to express them. What matters is the Zahir. So just like in the Wujud of Allah, His

Sam`, Basar, Hayah, Rahmah, etc., then likewise his Yad, Wajh, `Ayn etc.

When translating بل يداه مبسوطتان, we say with certainty that it means the Hands of Allah. That is the apparent from the verse according to the Salaf and the Ahl 'l-Sunnah. We are certain that Allah is attributed with Hands, just like we are: we just don't know the details - that would be delving into the Kayfiyyah which I refuse to do.

On the other hand, Ash`aris are in doubt whether translating Yad by Hand is correct vis-a-vis Allah. It could be anything really according to them. In fact, Ash`aris would argue amongst themselves whether Yad is even a Sifah of Allah to begin with. This is because the Zahir of Yad is anthropomorphism according to Ash`aris - a starting point of theirs that we totally reject and refute.

I see no reason to differentiate between Sam` and Yad. Allah has the attribute of hearing and so do the Makhluq, but the two are totally different. Allah has the attribute of Hand and so do the Makhluq, but the two are totally different.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Please be clear in your answers, and please don't answer with more questions unless they relate directly to this question (and not what you presume to be my belief).

I think you and I should start off two separate threads - each interrogating the other - instead of having one thread with questions flying from both sides. Agreed?

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> It is not necessary to know the exact details of the shared aspects. It is not even necessary to express them, or to be able to express them. What matters is the Zahir. So just like in the Wujud of Allah, His Sam`, Basar, Hayah, Rahmah, etc., then likewise his Yad, Wajh, `Ayn etc.
>
> ...
>
> I see no reason to differentiate between Sam` and Yad. Allah has the attribute of hearing and so do the Makhluq, but the two are totally different. Allah has the attribute of Hand and so do the Makhluq, but the two are totally different.

Thank you for being forthcoming with your answer. Let's stick with the example of 'ayn, although yad will work just as well.

IT says there is a "shared extent" (qadr mushtarak) equal between all entities bearing the property. That shared extent is common between Allah and creation. When a person, in his mind, determines the shared extent in the meaning of 'ayn, how do you assume he does that?

IT is clear in several places that the way a person affirms an attribute is to understand its shared meaning in what is present (shahid) to us:

من أثبت لله أمرا من الصفات **فإنما أثبته بعد بعد أن فهم ذلك من الموجودات**، وأثبت به القدر المطلق

And:

والإخبار عن الغائب لا يُفهم إن لم يُعبَّر عنه بالأسماء المعلومة معانيها في الشاهد، **ويُعلم بها ما في الغائب بواسطة العلم بما في الشاهد**، مع العلم بالفارق المميِّز، وأن ما أخبر الله به من الغيب أعظم مما يُعلم في الشاهد

When a person is affirming 'ayn for Allah *in his mind*, how do you think he will go about determining and extracting the common extent of this meaning of 'ayn from the things he sees and what is available to him? What is the process that will go through a normal person's mind in finding this "common meaning"? I'm not asking you what it is, but what is the basic thought process in determining it?

(You may move this to new thread)

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Take a simple look at another one of IT's works, where he does actually talk about the term Jism in relation to Allah from a Taqriri viewpoint i.e., establishing his own position on the term vis-a-vis Allah.

As promised...

On the question of *jism* in *Sharh Hadith al-Nuzul*, it is very clear IT dodges the question and obfuscates the matter. He merely attacks several definitions of *jism* and hides behind the Shar'i texts. I have looked through about the first 300 pages of the book. His discussion on *jism* starts from p. 237. (On a side note, the same principle which I highlighted above is also discussed at length right at the start of the book, p 75 onwards – he says things like لا نعلم ما غاب عنا إلا بمعرفة ما شهدناه & ثم بعقولنا نعتبر الغائب بالشاهد; I await HH's response to my last post.)

IT basically mentions that there are a few meanings of jism used by his "opponents": like being made up of *atoms* or of "form and substance" in the language of philosophers; or being made up of parts in the sense of someone having arranged the parts or the parts having been separated previously and then reunited or the parts having the possibility of being separated; or being made of flesh. These meanings Ibn Taymiyyah rejects, and says many things in creation itself are not like this, so what about Creator?!

But it was so simple for IT to reject the meaning we all have in our minds about jism, and that is something mutahayyiz, something occupying a fixed space with three dimensions, made of tangible parts. IT himself recognises this obvious meaning of mutahayyiz (e.g., on page 258). Yet, he never clearly negates it! As shown elsewhere IT *does* believe in tahayyuz for Allah, and says He is limited by hadds (boundaries) from all six directions, in his refutation of fellow Hanbali, Abu Ya'la, who said Allah only has one hadd from below and not in the other five. In this basic meaning of jism, of occupying a fixed 3d space and having these dimensions, it would be difficult for you to find anywhere that IT clearly rejects it. On the other hand, it appears he tries to avoid broaching the topic as much as possible, probably so he is not "caught out."

Some of the mutakallimun and some scholars (e.g., Raghib al-Asfahani– who came long before IT–in *Mufradat*) clearly defined jism as what has length, breadth and depth. One of the Imams of the Mutakallimin, Imam al-Ghazali (whose works IT was familiar with) clearly defined jism in this way also (أعني بالجسم عبارة عن مقدار له طول وعرض وعمق يمنع غيره من أن يوجد حيث هو إلا بأن يتنحى عن ذلك المكان - By jism I mean a [spatial] measurement that has length, breadth and depth, preventing other than it from being present where it is, unless it moves from that place). Even the Imam of the Ash'aris,

Abul Hasan al-Ash'ari, suggested this is the definition. Describing the beliefs of the Hishamiyyah i.e., Rafidi Mujassimahs, he said they believe their deity is a jism, having a limit and boundary, with length, breadth and width (Maqalat al-Islamiyyin). But IT never touched on this precise and clear definition!

Harris Hammam:

Posts moved from here:

The dangerous implications of ascribing a direction to Allah[1]

These posts were moved from that thread based on mutual agreement between myself and Hasan Saleem. The first question between us was HS saying:

> Since when did the belief of laymen become the litmus test for 'aqidah?!

Other posts in which Hasan Saleem and I were speaking to others have been left in that thread.

Whereas it had been more of a discussion format, but from now on in this thread, I will only be providing answers (Tahqiqi, no Ilzami answers allowed), and Hasan Saleem will be asking questions, insha'allah.

I'll start up another thread where I ask him some questions.

edit: this is the other thread - Questions by HH to HS[2]

[1] Hyperlinked thread no longer exists.

[2] The above-mentioned thread has been reproduced in this document. See next section.

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> When a person is affirming 'ayn for Allah in his mind, how do you think he will go about determining and extracting the common extent of this meaning of 'ayn from the things he sees and what is available to him? What is the process that will go through a normal person's mind in finding this "common meaning"? I'm not asking you what it is, but what is the basic thought process in determining it?

The Quran and Sunnah do not promote anthropomorphism - neither actively nor passively. In addition, as part of the Fitrah upon which people are born, they believe in a Supreme Being that is different from the creation. On that basis, I would argue that normal Muslims are not anthropomorphists - neither actively nor passively.

Now, if a Nass speaks about any of the attributes of Allah, the meaning a normal Muslim believes in is free from blemish.

When the Quran says the Hands of Allah, or His Eye, or His Face, the belief of a layman upon hearing this is free from fault unless proven otherwise.

The authentic Hadith says الله أرحم بعباده من هذه بولدها - Indeed, Allah is more merciful with His slaves than this woman is with her child.

This Hadith proves that using أفعل التفضيل for Allah is valid. As any person who is aware of the Arabic language knows, Ism 'l-Tafdil is used when comparing two things one is superior in one attribute. So, Allah is superior to the mother in the attribute of mercy. Both are attributed with mercy. It doesn't mean that there is any

anthropmorphism explicitly stated or even implied from this Hadith.

When the layman hears such a Hadith, it would be tough to argue that the layman would imply, or is duped into, anthropomorphism for believing in it literally on the flimsy basis that there is a Qadr Mushtarak of Rahmah between Allah and a mother.

Likewise, every Ism 'l-Tafdil that has been attributed to Allah.

With that in mind, let's turn to `Ayn, Yad and Wajh. I would argue that a layman would simply know the meaning and move on to believing in whatever is conveyed to him as befits Allah the Majestic. It is a very simply thought process.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> With that in mind, let's turn to `Ayn, Yad and Wajh. I would argue that a layman would simply know the meaning and move on to believing in whatever is conveyed to him as befits Allah the Majestic. It is a very simply thought process.

My question is: How would he know the meaning. Nobody is born knowing the meaning of 'ayn! He learns the meaning by education and upbringing. So, what is the process by which he understands its meaning?

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> But it was so simple for IT to reject the meaning we all have in our minds about jism, and that is something mutahayyiz, something occupying a fixed space with three dimensions, made of tangible parts... Yet, he

> never clearly negates it!... In this basic meaning of jism, of occupying a fixed 3d space and having these dimensions, it would be difficult for you to find anywhere that IT clearly rejects it. On the other hand, it appears he tries to avoid broaching the topic as much as possible, probably so he is not "caught out."
>
> Some of the mutakallimun and some scholars (e.g., Raghib al-Asfahani– who came long before IT–in Mufradat) clearly defined jism as what has length, breadth and depth. One of the Imams of the Mutakallimin, Imam al-Ghazali (whose works IT was familiar with) clearly defined jism in this way also (أعني بالجسم عبارة عن مقدار له طول وعرض وعمق يمنع غيره من أن يوجد حيث هو إلا بأن يتنحى عن ذلك المكان - By jism I mean a [spatial] measurement that has length, breadth and depth, preventing other than it from being present where it is, unless it moves from that place). Even the Imam of the Ash'aris, Abul Hasan al-Ash'ari, suggested this is the definition. Describing the beliefs of the Hishamiyyah i.e., Rafidi Mujassimahs, he said they believe their deity is a jism, having a limit and boundary, with length, breadth and width (Maqalat al-Islamiyyin). But IT never touched on this precise and clear definition!

I'll investigate this insha'allah and will get back as soon as possible.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> IT himself recognises this obvious meaning of mutahayyiz (e.g., on page 258).

Can you kindly quote the Arabic?

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> As shown elsewhere IT does believe in tahayyuz for Allah, and says He is limited by hadds (boundaries) from all six directions, in his refutation of fellow Hanbali, Abu Ya'la, who said Allah only has one hadd from below and not in the other five.

Please do care to quote the Arabic for both, so we may have a properly referenced discussion.

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> My question is: How would he know the meaning. Nobody is born knowing the meaning of 'ayn! He learns the meaning by education and upbringing. So what is the process by which he understands its meaning?

I really don't understand the purpose of this question. As demonstrated, people are brought up to understand all sorts of Sifat within the Makhluq including Rahmah, Sam`, Basar, Hayah, and then they hear the Allah is attributed with these as well - there isn't a problem in those, so why is it a problem for `Ayn?

My answer is as before: They hear the word and believe in it for Allah - obviously without any anthropmorphism.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Can you kindly quote the Arabic?
>
> Please do care to quote the Arabic for both, so we may have a properly referenced discussion.

I will do insha'allah. But for now, I'll like to concentrate on the discussion at hand.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> I really don't understand the purpose of this question. As demonstrated, people are brought up to understand all sorts of Sifat within the Makhluq including Rahmah, Sam`, Basar, Hayah, and then they hear the Allah is attributed with these as well - there isn't a problem in those, so why is it a problem for `Ayn?

I thought you said no ilzami questions. If you would like to ask me this question, I would be happy to answer on the other thread.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> My answer is as before: They hear the word and believe in it for Allah - obviously without any anthropmorphism.

That is not an answer. We can agree with ishtirak in the *lafz* ("word") 'ayn for Allah. But IT and you are saying something more. It is not just that we share the word. We share a common extent in the meaning of the word, which is the extent to which all who bear this property of 'ayn have. According to IT, once we have realised this common extent from creation, then we apply that to Allah with a particularity (in the modality) that makes Him different from those that we see in creation. My question, how would one

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> My answer is as before: They hear the word and believe in it for Allah - obviously without any anthropmorphism.

I should also ask: what do you mean by anthropomorphism?

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Originally Posted by HH:]
>
> I really don't understand the purpose of this question. As demonstrated, people are brought up to understand all sorts of Sifat within the Makhluq including Rahmah, Sam`, Basar, Hayah, and then they hear the Allah is attributed with these as well - there isn't a problem in those, so why is it a problem for `Ayn?
>
> I thought you said no ilzami questions. If you would like to ask me this question, I would be happy to answer on the other thread.

It's not an Ilzami question/answer. My answer simply was that they would adopt the same process as they would in Sam`, Basar, and Rahmah and any other Sifah of Allah.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Originally Posted by HH:]
>
> My answer is as before: They hear the word and believe in it for Allah - obviously without any anthropmorphism.
>
> That is not an answer. We can agree with ishtirak in the lafz ("word") 'ayn for Allah. But IT and you are saying

> something more. It is not just that we share the word. We share a common extent in the meaning of the word, which is the extent to which all who bear this property of 'ayn have. According to IT, once we have realised this common extent from creation, then we apply that to Allah with a particularity (in the modality) that makes Him different from those that we see in creation. My question, how would one determine what is the common extent of 'ayn by observing what is available to him?

I already said it is not necessary to know the exact details of the shared aspects. It is not even necessary to express them, or to be able to express them. That's the reason why we call laymen laymen. So, when translating بل يداه مبسوطتان, we say with certainty that it means the Hands of Allah as is the apparent from the verse according to the Salaf and the Ahl 'l-Sunnah. And we are certain that Allah is attributed with Hands, just like we are: we just don't know the details.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> I should also ask: what do you mean by anthropomorphism?

The belief that Allah's Sifat are like the Sifat of any of His Makhluq in terms of modality. As for whatever image comes in the mind, it doesn't mean laymen attribute that image to Allah. I don't think anybody says the image in the head is the actual reality of the Sifah of Allah. At the same time, ordinary Muslims know for sure they are not worshipping an unknown entity.

This comes back to the point I made that the Kitab and Sunnah do not promote anthropomorphism - actively or passively. Active promotion of anthropomorphism would be to say that Allah is like

His Makhluq, نعوذ بالله منه. Passive promotion of anthropomorphism is to believe the Zahir of some Nusus is Kufr, like Taftazani who said (bold) when commentating on Nasafi:

والنصوص من الكتاب والسنة تُحمل على ظواهرها ما لم يصرف عنها دليل قطعي كما في الآيات التي تشعر ظواهرها بالجهة والجسمية ونحو ذلك

i.e., the Quran and Sunnah inadvertently/passively promotes Tashbih, تعالى الله عن ذلك.

I cannot accept that the Zahir of the Kitab and Sunnah can contain Kufr.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> It's not an Ilzami question/answer. My answer simply was that they would adopt the same process as they would in Sam`, Basar, and Rahmah and any other Sifah of Allah.

And I have not accepted that same process for those attributes.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> I already said it is not necessary to know the exact details of the shared aspects. It is not even necessary to express them, or to be able to express them. That's the reason why we call laymen laymen. So, when translating بل يداه مبسوطتان, we say with certainty that it means the Hands of Allah as is the apparent from the verse according to the Salaf and the Ahl 'l-Sunnah. And we are certain that Allah is attributed with Hands, just like we are: we just don't know the details.

You still are not replying to the question. I am not asking you what are the shared aspects or the exact details, but how IT's theory plays

out in reality: You observe 'ayn in what is before you, decipher a common extent, and then attribute that to Allah with a distinction (in the modality) that makes Him unique. How would this process play in someone's mind? It's not a difficult question.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> The belief that Allah's Sifat are like the Sifat of any of His Makhluq in terms of modality

I see, so that does not negate the belief in "corporealism" that Allah is a physical and tangible body.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> As for whatever image comes in the mind, it doesn't mean laymen attribute that image to Allah. I don't think anybody says the image in the head is the actual reality of the Sifah of Allah.

But would you say it's ok for them to believe Allah is a physical body with physical dimensions. e.g., He has an eye, meaning a physical, tangible organ (with fixed 3d proportions) with which to see, but its "modality" i.e. size, shape, colour, etc. is totally different from creation and unknown? This honestly seems to be the logical conclusion of what both you and IT are saying, but it seems you are too scared to admit it.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> I cannot accept that the Zahir of the Kitab and Sunnah can contain Kufr

Well, you should tell that to your fellow Salafi, Ibn 'Uthaymin, who said the Zahir of "أأمنتم من فى السماء" is batil (i.e., kufr) as it entails Allah is encompassed by creation.

فإذا كان الله يقول ((أَأَمِنْتُمْ مَنْ فِي السَّمَاءِ)) [الملك 16] ، **فهذا ظاهره أن السماء محيطة بالله** ، وهذا الظاهر باطل

Would you say the zahir of every verse in Qur'an **(divorced of any interpretation from Rasul ﷺ and Sahabah)** has an acceptable meaning?!

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Originally Posted by HH:]
>
> > It's not an Ilzami question/answer. My answer simply was that they would adopt the csame process as they would in Sam`, Basar, and Rahmah and any other Sifah of Allah.
>
> And I have not accepted that same process for those attributes.

Good. I'll soon ask you why you do this on the other thread.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Originally Posted by HH:]
>
> > I already said it is not necessary to know the exact details of the shared aspects. It is not even necessary to express them, or to be able to express them. That's the reason why we call laymen laymen. So, when translating بل يداه مبسوطتان, we say with certainty that it means the Hands of Allah as is the apparent from the verse according to the Salaf and the Ahl 'l-Sunnah. And we are certain that Allah is attributed with Hands, just like we are: we just don't know the details.

> You still are not replying to the question. I am not asking you what are the shared aspects or the exact details, but how IT's theory plays out in reality: You observe 'ayn in what is before you, decipher a common extent, and then attribute that to Allah with a distinction (in the modality) that makes Him unique. How would this process play in someone's mind? It's not a difficult question.

I'm not sure if you're understanding me. The Quran/Sunnah says `Ayn, Wajh and Yad, the scholar tells the layman the Eye, Face and Hand, and the layman believes in them as befitting of Allah. What more is there to this?

> [Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]
>
> > [Originally Posted by HH:]
> >
> > > [Originally Posted by HS:]
> > >
> > > I should also ask: what do you mean by anthropomorphism?
> >
> > The belief that Allah's Sifat are like the Sifat of any of His Makhluq in terms of modality
>
> I see, so that does not negate the belief in "corporealism" that Allah is a physical and tangible body.

I feel I'm repeating myself. These are a) ambiguous terms, and b) not negated by the Shar`. Provide a Batil meaning for them and I'll negate it. Provide a truthful meaning and I'll affirm that meaning without affirming the innovated word itself. Provide an ambiguous definition and I'll say both the word and its definition are innovated, that can neither be affirmed nor negated.

I'm waiting for the Ibn Taymiyyah quotes.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Originally Posted by HH:]
>
> > As for whatever image comes in the mind, it doesn't mean laymen attribute that image to Allah. I don't think anybody says the image in the head is the actual reality of the Sifah of Allah.
>
> But would you say it's ok for them to believe Allah is a physical body with physical dimensions. e.g., He has a eye, meaning a physical, tangible organ (with fixed 3d proportions) with which to see, but its "modality" i.e. size, shape, colour, etc. is totally different from creation and unknown? This honestly seems to be the logical conclusion of what both you and IT are saying, but it seems you are too scared to admit it.

Now you are putting words in my mouth. I never said it's ok for a person to say or believe that Allah is a physical body with physical dimensions. These are innovations. You can assume whatever logical conclusion you think there is to our silence, but we refuse to accept your innovated line of questioning.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> I'm not sure if you're understanding me. The Quran/Sunnah says `Ayn, Wajh and Yad, the scholar tells the layman the Eye, Face and Hand, and the layman believes in them as befitting of Allah. What more is there to this?

What's more is what you and IT add. e.g., the *literal* meaning; the common extent of the word; drawing analogy on the present with the absent etc. I think we should leave this line of questioning, as it

is clear you are simply ignoring what IT clearly said and you agreed to, and are acting as if it doesn't exist. I'm sure readers will see that.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> These are a) ambiguous terms, and b) not negated by the Shar`

You don't have to blindly imitate IT. There is absolutely nothing ambiguous about a "physical and tangible body" in the English language.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Now you are putting words in my mouth. I never said it's ok for a person to say or believe that Allah is a physical body with physical dimensions. These are innovations.

Ok, let me put this question to you:

A person never says it. He never claims or utters that Allah is in a physical location, occupying a particular 3D space. (By the way, these are NOT ambiguous terms but are completely clear! So please don't say they are ambiguous!). But he believes it. He believes this is what the verses talking about the "sifat" like hand, foot, eye, shin, face, eye, form (surah), etc. literally mean i.e., <u>that Allah is a physical body occupying a measurable 3 dimensional space.</u> However, <u>at the same time he believes Allah is completely different to all creation,</u> in the sense that His hand etc. are not made of the same material as that of creation; moreover, they are vastly bigger, of a different shape, colour and so on. These "modalities" he believes he doesn't know. But he knows for sure that they are physical parts, occupying a 3d space (in the precise way Ghazali said: (*أعني بالجسم عبارة عن مقدار له طول وعرض وعمق يمنع غيره من أن يوجد حيث هو إلا بأن يتنحى عن ذلك المكان*). Is

this person an innovator according to you? Please do not dodge the question.

Harris Hammam:

As for the al-`Uthaymin statement, "my fellow Salafi" as you say, I can't tell him anything because he passed away over a decade ago. I have no problems in telling you he erred if I think he made a mistake. The problem here though is that you grossly miscontextualised his statement. He said that as part of an Ishkal on the , to which he was going to respond immediately after. After asserting the `Uluww of Allah:

والشاهد من هذه الآية هو قوله : { من في السماء } . والذي في السماء هو الله عز وجل وهو دليل على علو الله بذاته .

he brings the Ishkal as follows:

لكن هاهنا إشكال ، وهو أن (في) للظرفية ، فإذا كان الله في السماء ، و (في) للظرفية ، فإن الظرف محيط بالمظروف! أرأيت لو قلت : الماء في الكأس ، فالكأس محيط بالماء وأوسع من الماء! فإذا كان الله يقول : { أأمنتم من في السماء } ، فهذا ظاهره أن السماء محيطة بالله ، وهذا الظاهر باطل ، وإذا كان الظاهر باطلا ، فإننا نعلم علم اليقين أنه غير مرادلله؛ لأنه لا يمكن أن يكون ظاهر الكتاب والسنة باطلا.

فما الجواب على هذا الإشكال؟

He then answers it:

قال العلماء: الجواب أن نسلك أحد طريقين...:

At no point in time did he say or believe that the Zahir of this verse is Kufr in the answer.

You see, Zahir is relative from sect to sect. The people who believe the Zahir of the verses of Sifat are Kufr are the Mu`tazilites and the Ash`aris. We don't believe the Zahir is Kufr, therefore you cannot extrapolate Takfir from your understand of the Zahir being Kufr

to our affirmation of the Zahir, because our understandings of Zahir are different.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> You see, Zahir is relative from sect to sect. The people who believe the Zahir of the verses of Sifat are Kufr are the Mu`tazilites and the Ash`aris. We don't believe the Zahir is Kufr, therefore you cannot extrapolate Takfir from your understanding of the Zahir being Kufr to our affirmation of the Zahir, because our understandings of Zahir are different.

So zahir is an ambiguous term? Or is there a clear principle by which to determine it?

I await your answer to my previous question.

Harris Hammam:

I think you've gone a few steps too far ahead. Before I answer your questions, can you please provide the Ibn Taymiyyah statements so I can see whether you took them out of context or not (like you did to S. al-`Uthaymin, may Allah have mercy on him)

[Originally Posted by HS:]

> As shown elsewhere IT does believe in tahayyuz for Allah, and says He is limited by hadds (boundaries) from all six directions, in his refutation of fellow Hanbali, Abu Ya'la, who said Allah only has one hadd from below and not in the other five. In this basic meaning of jism, of occupying a fixed 3d space and having these dimensions, it would be difficult for you to find anywhere that IT clearly rejects it. On the other

> hand, it appears he tries to avoid broaching the topic as much as possible, probably so he is not "caught out."

Because I think this is an important aspect of the discussion. Jazakallah.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Before I answer your questions, can you please provide the Ibn Taymiyyah statements so I can see whether you took them out of context or not (like you did to S. al-`Uthaymin, may Allah have mercy on him

Ibn 'Uthaymin did not contest what he mentioned in the ishkal, that that is the "zahir" of the verse. Maybe in his special istilah, zahir has a different meaning to what he mentioned in the ishkal. But that just begs the question, what is the intent of "zahir" and how do you determine it?

As for IT's statements, I did not start that line of questioning - you did with the Sharh Hadith al-Nuzul comment. And then I replied and you moved the reply to this thread amidst my other posts where I put my questions to you. Anyhow, the quote on Hudud in discussing Abu Ya'la's opinion is found in Bayan Talbis al-Jahmiyyah. If you want me to post the quote, please ask on the other thread. With regards to tahayyuz, IT takes different approaches; at times, he clearly says it is an ambiguous term, and at other times, seems to suggest it has a known meaning. Regardless, this is not the subject of the thread. Please answer the question I mentioned earlier, namely:

> A person never says it. He never claims or utters that Allah is in a physical location, occupying a particular 3D space. (By the way, these are NOT ambiguous terms

> but are completely clear! So please don't say they are ambiguous!). But he believes it. He believes this is what the verses [and hadiths] talking about the "sifat" like hand, foot, eye, shin, face, eye, form (surah), etc literally mean i.e., that Allah is a physical body occupying a measurable 3 dimensional space. However, at the same time he believes Allah is completely different to all creation, in the sense that His hand etc. are not made of the same material as that of creation; moreover, they are vastly bigger, of a different shape, colour and so on. These "modalities" he believes he doesn't know. But he knows for sure that they are physical parts, occupying a 3d space (in the precise way Ghazali said: (أعني بالجسم عبارة عن مقدار له طول وعرض وعمق يمنع غيره من أن يوجد حيث هو إلا بأن يتنحى عن ذلك المكان).

Is this person an innovator according to you? [If yes, on what grounds?] Please do not dodge the question.

Abu Sulayman:

HH wants a proof for the following:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> As shown elsewhere IT does believe in tahayyuz for Allah, and says He is limited by hadds (boundaries) from all six directions, in his refutation of fellow Hanbali, Abu Ya'la, who said Allah only has one hadd from below and not in the other five.

The following post contains some proofs for this:

هـ - إثباتهم التناهي والمحدودية لذات الله تعالى:

كثير من الوهابية وأتباع ابن تيمية ينكرون نسبة بعض العقائد الشاذة له مع صراحة نصوصه ووضوحها في إثباتها , واعتادوا اتهام مخالفيهم بالكذب والزور على ابن تيمية أو عدم فهم كلامه ومقصوده , ثم لا تمضي مدة طويلة من الزمان حتى تجدهم يثبتون على استحياء تلك العقائد التي نزّهوه عنها , ثم بعد فترة تصبح عندهم تلك العقائد عين ما جاء به الكتاب والسنة وسلف الأمة ولا يألون جهًدا في الدفاع عنها , ومن أشد العقائد التي أنكر الوهابية نسبتها لابن تيمية عقيدة الحد لله تعالى , وما زال كثير منهم حتى الآن يكذّبون كلّ من نسبها لابن تيمية , ويرمونه كعادتهم بالتدليس والتلاعب وعدم فهم مقصود شيخهم , وقد وجدتُ رسالة اسمها:

)الرد على منكر الحد من كلام شيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية(

أعدّها اثنان من الوهابية هما مسلط العتيبي وعادل آل حمدان , وجعلاها ذيلاً لرسالة الدشتي المجسم المعروف في الحد والقعود , وحاولا تبرير موقفهم المحرج في إخراج لتلك الرسالة بقولهما عن الدشتي : (ولم يأت بمحدث من القول , ولا بمنكر من الاعتقاد) , ثم أرادا أن يخوّفا القارئ من الاعتراض على الكتاب لئلا يقع في مخالفة من يسمونهم بأئمة السنة , فقالا ص6:

)وعليه فلا تعجل أخي القارئ بردّ هذا الكتاب ولا ما جاء فيه عن أئمة أهل السنة! , فتقع في مخالفتهم , فإنه لم يأت إنكار هاتين المسألتين غالبًا إلا عن الجهمية أعداء السنة والتوحيد , نفاة صفات رب العالمين , فعنهم تلقفها من جاء بعدهم. (..

ومما نقلوه عن ابن تيمية في إثبات الحدّ لله تعالى , مناقشته القاضي أبا يعلى الفراء حينما أثبت الحد لله تعالى من جهة التحت المحاذية للعرش دون الجهات الخمس , فاعترض عليه ابن تيمية بأن الحد ثابت من سائر الجهات!! , وهذا صريح في إثبات امتداد الله تعالى في الأبعاد , فنقلوا في رسالتهم (ص222-226) عن ابن تيمية قوله:

..) -34والنفي هو طريقة القاضي أبي يعلى أولا في المعتمد وغيره , فإنه كان ينفي الحد والجهة وهو قوله الأول.

[ثم أطال ابن تيمية رحمه الله في نقل كلام القاضي في تقرير هذه المسألة (3/3-21)] , ثم قال شيخ الإسلام :

قال القاضي : وإذا ثبت استواؤه وأنه في جهة وأن ذلك من صفات الذات , فهل يجوز إطلاق الحد عليه؟ قد أطلق أحمد القول بذلك في رواية المروذي , فقد ذكر له قول ابن المبارك نعرف

الله على العرش بحد , فقال أحمد: بلغني ذلك وأعجبه , وقال الأثرم : قلت لأحمد يحكى عن ابن المبارك نعرف ربنا في السماء السابعة على عرشه بحد , فقال أحمد: هكذا هو عندنا. ...

.....ثم قال -أي أبو يعلى- : ويجب أن يحمل اختلاف كلام أحمد في إثبات الحد على اختلاف حالين , فالموضع الذي قال إنه على العرش بحد معناه ما حاذى العرش من ذاته فهو حد له وجهة له , والموضع الذي قال هو على العرش بغير حد معناه ما عدا الجهة المحاذية للعرش وهي الفوق والخلف والأمام والميمنة والميسرة , وكان الفرق بين جهة التحت المحاذية للعرش وبين غيرها ما ذكرنا أن جهة التحت تحاذي العرش بما قد ثبت من الدليل , والعرش محدود فجاز أن يوصف ما حاذاه من الذات أنه حد وجهة , وليس كذلك فيما عداه لأنه لا يحاذي ما هو محدود بل هو مار في الميمنة والميسرة والفوق والأمام والخلف إلى غير غاية , فلهذا لم يوصف واحد من ذلك بالحد والجهة , وجهة العرش تحاذي ما قابله من جهة الذات ولم تحاذ جميع الذات لأنه لا نهاية لها.

قلت –أي ابن تيمية- : هذا الذي جمع به بين كلامي أحمد وأثبت الحد والجهة من ناحية العرش والتحت دون الجهات الخمس , يخالف ما فسر به كلام أحمد أولا من التفسير المطابق لصريح ألفاظه (1) , حيث قال: فقد نفى الحد عنه على الصفة المذكورة وهو الذي يعلمه خلقه , والموضع الذي أطلقه محمول على معنيين : أحدهما يقال على جهة مخصوصة وليس هو ذاهبا في الجهات بل هو خارج العالم متميز عن خلقه منفصل عنهم غير داخل في كل الجهات , وهذا معنى قول أحمد حد لا يعلمه إلا هو , والثاني أنه على صفة يبين بها عن غيره ويتميز فهو تعالى فرد واحد ممتنع عن الاشتراك له في أخص صفاته , قال : منعنا من إطلاق القول بالحد في غير موضع من كتابنا ويجب أن يجوز على الوجه الذي ذكرناه , فهذا القول الوسط من أقوال القاضي الثلاثة هو المطابق لكلام أحمد وغيره من الأئمة , وقد قال إنه تعالى في جهة مخصوصة وليس هو ذاهبا في الجهات بل هو خارج العالم متميز عن خلقه منفصل عنهم غير داخل في كل الجهات , وهذا معنى قول أحمد حد لا يعلمه إلا هو , ولو كان مراد أحمد الحد من جهة العرش فقط لكان ذلك معلوما لعباده , فإنهم قد عرفوا أن حدّه من هذه الجهة هو العرش , فعلم أن الحد الذي لا يعلمونه مطلق لا يختص بجهة العرش. (

وهذا واضح في إثبات الحد لله تعالى من سائر الجهات وليس مختصًا بجهة التحت المحاذية للعرش فقط.

وإليك بعض نصوص ابن تيمية في إثبات الحد والنهاية أيضًا:

-35قال ابن تيمية في بيان التلبيس: (1/97)

)وأما وصفه بالحد والنهاية الذي تقول أنت أنه معنى الجسم , فهم فيه كسائر أهل الإثبات على ثلاثة أقوال: منهم من يثبت ذلك , كما هو المنقول عن السلف والأئمة , ومنهم من نفى ذلك , ومنهم من لا يتعرض له بنفي ولا إثبات(

فهو ينقل ثلاثة أقوال في إثبات المحدودية والنهاية لذات الله تعالى وهو الذي يسميه الإمام الرازي بالتجسيم , ويرى ابن تيمية أن سلف الأمة وأئمتها يثبتون ذلك .

-36وقال أيضًا: (1/595)

(فإن ضرورة صير المتحيز متحيزًا توجب الانقلابات ، لكن هذا التحيز هو القسم الأول وهو التحيز اللازم للمتحيز الذي يمتنع انفصاله عنه , والمراد بالحيز في هذا المتحيز إما أمر عدمي أو إضافي , أو المراد به جوانب المتحيز ونهايته ، فلو كان في الأزل مبرءً عن هذا ثم صار موصوفًا به لزم الانقلاب)(2)

فيثبت الجوانب والنهاية لله تعالى منذ الأزل , لأن حدوث اتصافه بها يستلزم الانقلاب في ذاته تعالى.

-37ويرى أن الحيز الذي هو نهايات المتحيز وحدوده بعض من ذات الله تعالى وأنه أبلغ من صفاته الذاتية , فيقول:

(يقال له: هؤلاء إذا قالوا بأنه مختص بحيز وجودي أزلًا وأبدًا فليس ذلك عندهم شيئًا خارجًا عن مسمى الله كما أنالحيز الذي هو نهايات المتحيز وحدوده الداخلة فيه ليس خارجًا عنه بل هو منه. وعلى هذا التقدير فيكون إثباتهم لقدم هذا الحيز كإثبات سائر الصفاتية للصفات القديمة من علمه وقدرته وحياته لا فرق بين تحيزه وبين قيامه بنفسه وحياته وسائر صفاته اللازمة، والحيز مثل الحياة والعلم بل أبلغ منه في لزومه للذات، كما أنه كذلك في سائر المتحيزات. فالحيز الذي هو داخل في المتحيز الذي هو حدوده وجوانبه ونواحيه ونهاياته أبلغ في لزومه لذاته من بعض الصفات كالسمع والبصر والقدرة وغير ذلك)(3)

-38وقال في إثبات بعضية هذا الحيز أيضا:

(وقد يقال لنفس جوانبه وأقطاره إنها حيزه , فيكون حيزه بعضا منه)(4)

Source: Comment #14: "الصفات الإلهية بين أهل التنزيه وأهل التشبيه"[3]

(Note: The website doesn't work at the moment, but insha`Allah after some hours it should work again.)

The quote 34 contains the statement of al-Qadhi Abu Ya'la (d. 458 AH) and how Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 AH) commented it. (One can find it here in "Bayan Talbis al-Jahmiyyah": بيان تلبيس الجهمية في تأسيس بدعهم الكلامية/7 - ويكي مصدر)[4]

If it's wanted I can also post the other place where IT comments the words of Abu Ya'la regarding the same matter.

(But the above is already clear enough.)

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Ibn 'Uthaymin did not contest what he mentioned in the ishkal, that that is the "zahir" of the verse. Maybe in his special istilah, zahir has a different meaning to what he mentioned in the ishkal. But that just begs the question, what is the intent of "zahir" and how do you determine it?

---

[3] The Arabic text here was hyperlinked with the following link (it appears to not be currently working but has been included here in case it becomes functional again sometime in the future):
http://www.aslein.net/showthread.php?t=16941&p=102738#post102738

[4] Hyperlink:
http://ar.wikisource.org/wiki/%D8%A8%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%86_%D8%AA%D9%84%D8%A8%D9%8A%D8%B3_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D9%87%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%A9_%D9%81%D9%8A_%D8%AA%D8%A3%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%B3_%D8%A8%D8%AF%D8%B9%D9%87%D9%85_%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%83%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%A9/7

No need to justify your poor miscontextualisation of al-`Uthaymin, taking a snippet out of a potential Ishkal he mentioned. He clearly didn't say that it is the Zahir in the answer that requires some Ta'wil (like Ash`aris do).

I already told you the Zahir differs according to the theological position you have on the Nusus. So for the anthropmorphists, the Zahir is anthropomophism and full stop, and Ibn Kathir alludes to this (والظاهر المتبادر إلى أذهان المشبهين منفي عن الله). For Ash`aris, the Zahir is also anthropomorphic and thus they do Tafwid/Ta'wil as a result. For the Salaf, the Zahir is intended and it is not anthropomorphic in the least. The only Zahir that is mu`tabar is how the Salaf explained those verses, not the Zahir according to Ash`aris. As thus, when the Salaf say بعلمه after وهو معكم أينما كنتم, what they intend is that `ilm is the Zahir of the verse.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> As for IT's statements, I did not start that line of questioning - you did with the Sharh Hadith al-Nuzul comment. And then I replied and you moved the reply to this thread amidst my other posts where I put my questions to you. Anyhow, the quote on Hudud in discussing Abu Ya'la's opinion is found in Bayan Talbis al-Jahmiyyah. If you want me to post the quote, please ask on the other thread.

If I remember correctly, I just provided a reference for IT's Kalam in Jism, but you went off on a tangent when you started speaking of this something elsewhere:

> But it was so simple for IT to reject the meaning we all have in our minds about jism, and that is something mutahayyiz, something occupying a fixed space with three dimensions, made of tangible parts. IT himself

> recognises this obvious meaning of mutahayyiz (e.g., on page 258). Yet, he never clearly negates it! As shown elsewhere IT does believe in tahayyuz for Allah, and says He is limited by hadds (boundaries) from all six directions, in his refutation of fellow Hanbali, Abu Ya'la, who said Allah only has one hadd from below and not in the other five. In this basic meaning of jism, of occupying a fixed 3d space and having these dimensions, it would be difficult for you to find anywhere that IT clearly rejects it. On the other hand, it appears he tries to avoid broaching the topic as much as possible, probably so he is not "caught out."

So where is this please? You brought it into the discussion so I would like some further details on it, with proper Arabic references from IT's works. You can't expect to make a random statement and tell me to ask on the other thread about it. This is very much connected to this thread and I insist you assist us all by providing the Arabic reference.

(Abu Sulayman, I really can't be bothered reading your amateurish long-winded posts and copy-pastes so please save yourself the trouble)

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Please answer the question I mentioned earlier, namely:
>
> > A person never says it. He never claims or utters that Allah is in a physical location, occupying a particular 3D space. (By the way, these are NOT ambiguous terms but are completely clear! So please don't say they are ambiguous!). But he believes it. He believes this is what the verses [and hadiths] talking about the "sifat" like hand, foot,

> eye, shin, face, eye, form (surah), etc literally mean i.e., that Allah is a physical body occupying a measurable 3 dimensional space. However, at the same time he believes Allah is completely different to all creation, in the sense that His hand etc. are not made of the same material as that of creation; moreover, they are vastly bigger, of a different shape, colour and so on. These "modalities" he believes he doesn't know. But he knows for sure that they are physical parts, occupying a 3d space (in the precise way Ghazali said: (أعني بالجسم عبارة عن مقدار له طول وعرض وعمق يمنع غيره من أن يوجد حيث هو إلا بأن يتنحى عن ذلك المكان). Is this person an innovator according to you? [If yes, on what grounds?] Please do not dodge the question.

If this all there is that he believes in, assuming he doesn't believe in even more problematic items, then I submit these beliefs are innovations, on the basis of introducing into belief that what the Shar` is silent on. This is connected to the جسم لا كالأجسام issue.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> I already told you the Zahir differs according to the theological position you have on the Nusus. So, for the anthropmorphists, the Zahir is anthropomophism and full stop, and Ibn Kathir alludes to this (والظاهر المتبادر إلى أذهان المشبهين منفي عن الله). For Ash`aris, the Zahir is also anthropomorphic and thus they do Tafwid/Ta'wil as a result.

Ibn Kathir uses zahir in the meaning of "mutabadir ilal adhhan" (what comes immediately to the minds). **In this sense, Ash'aris do not say the zahir is kufr.** So please stop repeating it.

When Ash'aris negate zahir, it is in two meanings. As you quoted Fudah, you can see p 77 onwards from his Naqd al-Tadmuriyyah where he discusses this issue (download here), and refutes the very argument you are making (in blind imitation of IT). The first meaning Ash'aris negate is what Ibn Kathir mentioned: the meaning that immediately comes to the mind of anthropomorphists, NOT the meaning that comes to the mind of Sunni Muslims - whose view about Allah are governed by the clear verses on tanzih, laysa kamithli shay, lam yakullahu kufwan ahad, hal ta'lamu lahu samiyya, lillahil mathalul a'la, and hadith laysa lahu shabihun wa la 'adl. Zahir is negated in this sense tanzzulan (meaning, for arguments sake accepting that this is the zahir as the mushabbihah say). Otherwise, the zahir certainly is not anthropomorphic. This is what is known as "zahir bid dalil" and Ash'aris certainly do not say that this is anthropomorphic! If they did, that would negate their entire madhhab (which is obviously what you and IT hope by saying this).

The other meaning of zahir, is zahir lughatan, meaning the literal and linguistic meaning assigned by the Arabs. Literal meaning of for example yad is a jarihah or 'udw. This meaning is certainly negated. When Ash'aris say we do either tafwid or ta'wil, it does not mean the meaning that immediately comes to the mind is kufr. There is no connection between the two. e.g., the meaning that comes to mind in for example istawa 'ala l-'arsh is that Allah assumed sovereignty by administering orders in the creation (tadbir) - and this is zahir (clear) from the context and language. Similarly, the meaning that comes in bal yadahu mabsutatan is that Allah is generous and gives abundantly. However, as an attribute of

action or essence, istiwa and yad, their meanings are not known - this is where tafwid is done. The meaning that comes to the mind upon reading the verses is certainly not kufr. I hope that is clear to you now.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> If I remember correctly, I just provided a reference for IT's Kalam in Jism, but you went off on a tangent when you started speaking of this something elsewhere:
>
> > But it was so simple for IT to reject the meaning we all have in our minds about jism, and that is something mutahayyiz, something occupying a fixed space with three dimensions, made of tangible parts. IT himself recognises this obvious meaning of mutahayyiz (e.g., on page 258). Yet, he never clearly negates it! As shown elsewhere IT does believe in tahayyuz for Allah, and says He is limited by hadds (boundaries) from all six directions, in his refutation of fellow Hanbali, Abu Ya'la, who said Allah only has one hadd from below and not in the other five. In this basic meaning of jism, of occupying a fixed 3d space and having these dimensions, it would be difficult for you to find anywhere that IT clearly rejects it. On the other hand, it appears he tries to avoid broaching the topic as much as possible, probably so he is not "caught out."
>
> So where is this please? You brought it into the discussion so I would like some further details on it, with proper Arabic references from IT's works. You can't expect to make a random statement and tell me to

> ask on the other thread about it. This is very much connected to this thread and I insist you assist us all by providing the Arabic reference.
>
> (Abu Sulayman, I really can't be bothered reading your amateurish long-winded posts and copy-pastes so please save yourself the trouble)

By elsewhere, I meant in Abu Sulayman's posts, where he referred to this passage of IT frequently, but you probably don't read. For the full text, see pages 303-5 here.[5]

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> If this all there is that he believes in, assuming he doesn't believe in even more problematic items, then I submit these beliefs are innovations, on the basis of introducing into belief that what the Shar` is silent on. This is connected to the جسم لا كالأجسام issue.

Alhamdulillah, you have done what IT, IQ and your Salafi scholars could not. But now, I want to ask you: what if this person argues:

> How can you accuse me of innovation? I am only accepting the zahir, literal meanings of the sifat: wajh, yadayn, 'aynayn, qadam, saq, samad (unhollow), surah (human form), and the descriptions of jihah, makan, uluww (hissi), all of which mean Allah is located in a specific 3d place with specific measurements. And at the same time, he says: I am not doing tashbih, the modalities of these attributes are completely unlike creation, far greater, bigger and so on. In other words, he is saying: I am doing exactly what you and IT told

[5] Hyperlink: https://ia601509.us.archive.org/3/items/alqawlultamam/alqawlultamam.pdf

> me to do, nothing more and nothing less. So how can you call me an innovator? On what basis am I an innovator, when I am only accepting the literal, zahir meaning of these sifat?

(This is not a hypothetical, as at least some IT followers, explicitly believe in a size and specific 3d measurements for Allah - so please do not dodge the question).

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Ibn Kathir uses zahir in the meaning of "mutabadir ilal adhhan" (what comes immediately to the minds). **In this sense, Ash'aris do not say the zahir is kufr.** So please stop repeating it.

Well, that's what I said. Ash`aris and the anthropomorphists are the same in the sense that the first thing that comes to their minds when readings the verses and Hadith on Sifat is Jihah, Jismiyyah, Tashbih, etc.

That is not the first apparent meaning insofar as the Salaf were concerned.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> When Ash'aris negate zahir, it is in two meanings. As you quoted Fudah, you can see p 77 onwards from his Naqd al-Tadmuriyyah where he discusses this issue (download here),[6] and refutes the very argument you are making (in blind imitation of IT). The first

[6] Hyperlink:
http://www.4shared.com/office/KY3Pc4W6/_-_.htm

> meaning Ash'aris negate is what Ibn Kahtir mentioned: the meaning that immediately comes to the mind of anthropomorphists, NOT the meaning that comes to the mind of Sunni Muslims - whose view about Allah are governed by the clear verses on tanzih, laysa kamithli shay, lam yakullahu kufwan ahad, hal ta'lamu lahu samiyya, lillahil mathalul a'la, and hadith laysa lahu shabihun wa la 'adl. Zahir is negated in this sense tanzzulan (meaning, for arguments sake accepting that this is the zahir as the mushabbihah say). Otherwise, the zahir certainly is not anthropomorphic. This is what is known as "zahir bid dalil" and Ash'aris certainly do not say that this is anthropomorphic! If they did, that would negate their entire madhhab (which is obviously what you and IT hope by saying this).

I'm not sure who before Fudah - whom you eventually just had to cite from - ever said that the Ash`ari Usul of " ظواهر نصوص الصفات تستلزم الجهة والجسمية" is stated only Tanazzulan.

It is quite clear reading the classical Mutakallimun literature that they actually did intend that the Zahir of the Nusus is Kufr. Nothing else would explain their stances of Tafwid and/or Ta'wil, and lack of Ithbat. After all Tafwid and Ta'wil are only made by them in Nusus that are problematic in their apparent meaning.

Simply put, I don't agree with Fudah, nor am I blindly imitating IT (you really are getting emotional in your rhetoric - I thought you would be a bit more sensible) but rather I agree with him based on principle. What everyone needs to understand is that the Ash`aris believe that ظاهر النص غير مراد - the Zahir of the text in what they deem to be problematic Sifat are not intended.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> The other meaning of zahir, is zahir lughatan, meaning the literal and linguistic meaning assigned by the Arabs. Literal meaning of for example yad is a jarihah or 'udw. This meaning is certainly negated. When Ash'aris say we do either tafwid or ta'wil, it does not mean the meaning that immediately comes to the mind is kufr. There is no connection between the two. e.g., the meaning that comes to mind in for example istawa 'ala l-'arsh is that Allah assumed sovereignty by administering orders in the creation (tadbir) - and this is zahir (clear) from the context and language. Similarly, the meaning that comes in bal yadahu mabsutatan is that Allah is generous and gives abundantly. However, as an attribute of action or essence, istiwa and yad, their meanings are not known - this is where tafwid is done. The meaning that comes to the mind upon reading the verses is certainly not kufr. I hope that is clear to you now.

The problem with this understanding is that it is at odds with the understanding the Salaf possessed. Never once did they feel the need move away from the Lughah when these words were used for Allah. This is a fundamental point of difference that I feel is irreconcilable.

On the specifics of Istiwa being reinterpreted as Tadbir, that may have worked - even that's a stretch - in the Hud verse, but where the word Tadbir is not found like in Taha, it is difficult to assume that Tadbir is intended. The Salaf emphatically affirmed Istiwa as a standalone attribute and did not reinterpret it with Tadbir. It's a similar case with Yad.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Alhamdulillah, you have done what IT, IQ and your Salafi scholars could not. But now, I want to ask you: what if this person argues:
>
> > How can you accuse me of innovation? I am only accepting the zahir, literal meanings of the sifat: wajh, yadayn, 'aynayn, qadam, saq, samad (unhollow), surah (human form), and the descriptions of jihah, makan, uluww (hissi), all of which mean Allah is located in a specific 3d place with specific measurements. And at the same time, he says: I am not doing tashbih, the modalities of these attributes are completely unlike creation, far greater, bigger and so on. In other words, he is saying: I am doing exactly what you and IT told me to do, nothing more and nothing less. So how can you call me an innovator? On what basis am I an innovator, when I am only accepting the literal, zahir meaning of these sifat?
>
> (This is not a hypothetical, as at least some IT followers, explicitly believe in a size and specific 3d measurements for Allah - so please do not dodge the question).

As I mentioned, the Zahir is how the Salaf understood these verses to be. They didn't imply Makan, Jihah and all these other innovated terms from the Nusus.

As thus, his faulty understanding of the Nusus is to blame, not Ibn Taymiyyah or other scholars. And by the way, they do say using all these terms is a Bid`ah, so please stop misquoting them.

Abu Sulayman:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Alhamdulillah, you have done what IT, IQ and your Salafi scholars could not. But now, I want to ask you: what if this person argues:

Brother read his words again and carefully, because he uses deceptive talk.

He's not saying that this is an innovation with the meaning that it's a batil and kufri belief, but rather he only says that one shouldn't make any statement regarding this "on the basis of introducing into belief that what the Shar` is silent on".

So, he let the door to Tajsim still open and still regards Tajsim as an option that maybe correct and not something that is impossible regarding Allah subhanahu wa ta'ala.

His "Shaykh al-Islam" Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 AH) said the following:

ومن عارضكم من المثبتة أهل الكلام من المرجئة وغيرهم كالكرامية والهشامية وقال لكم فليكن هذا لازما للرؤية وليكن هو جسما أو قال لكم: أنا أقول إنه جسم وناظركم على ذلك بالمعقول وأثبته بالمعقول كما نفيتموه بالمعقول لم يكن لكم أن تقولوا له: أنت مبتدع في إثبات الجسم فإنه يقول لكم: وأنتم مبتدعون في نفيه فالبدعة في نفيه كالبدعة في إثباته وإن لم تكن أعظم بل النافي أحق بالبدعة من المثبت لأن المثبت أثبت ما أثبتته النصوص وذكر هذا معاضدة للنصوص وتأييدا لها وموافقة لها وردا على من خالف موجبها

فإن قدر أنه أنه ابتدع في ذلك كانت بدعته أخف من بدعة من نفى ذلك نفيا عارض به النصوص ن ودفع موجبها ومقتضاها فإن ما خالف النصوص فهو بدعة باتفاق المسلمين وما لم يعلم أنه خالفها فقد يسمى بدعة

قال الشافعي رضي الله تعالى عنه: البدعة بدعتان: بدعة خالفت كتابا أو سنة أو إجماعا أو أثرا عن بعض أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فهذه بدعة ضلالة وبدعة لم تخالف شيئا

من ذلك فهذه قد تكون حسنة لقول عمر: نعمت البدعة هذه هذا الكلام أو نحوه رواه البيهقي بإسناده الصحيح في المدخل

ومن المعلوم أن قول نفاة الرؤية والصفات والعلو على العرش والقائلين بأن الله لم يتلكم بل خلق كلاما في غيره ونفيهم ذلك لأن إثبات ذلك تجسيم هو إلي مخالفة الكتاب والسنة والإجماع السلفي والآثار أقرب من قول من أثبت ذلك وقال . مع ذلك . ألفاظا يقول: : إنها توافق معنى الكتاب والسنة لا سيما والنفاة متفقون على أن ظواهر النصوص تجسيم عندهم وليس عندهم بالنفي نص فهم معترفون بأن قولهم هو البدعة وقول منازعهم أقرب إلى السنة

ومما يوضح هذا أن السلف والأئمة كثر كلامهم في ذم الجهمية النفاة للصفات وذموا المشبهة أيضا وذلك في كلامهم أقل بكثير من ذم الجهمية لأن مرض التعطيل أعظم من مرض التشبيه وأما ذكر التجسيم وذم المجسمة فهو لا يعرف في كلام أحد من السلف والأئمة كما لا يعرف في كلامهم أيضا القول بأن الله جسم أو ليس بجسم بل ذكروا في كلامهم الذي أنكروه على الجهمية نفي الجسم كما ذكره أحمد في كتاب الرد على الجهمية: ولما ناظر برغوث وألزمه بأنه جسم امتنع أحمد من موافقته على النفي والإثبات وقال: هو أحد صمد لم يلد ولم يولد لم يكن له كفوا أحد

Source: "Dar` Ta'arrudh al-'Aql wal Naql"[7]

As you see it's clear from the above qoute that IT does not regard the statement that "Allah is a Jism" (High Exalted is Allah above what the Dhalimin claim!) as a true and real Bid'ah (i.e., not just in wording, but also in meaning!).

He even brings the qoute of Imam al-Shafi'i (d. 204 AH) regarding good Bid'ah.

(Note: HH I'm not posting this for you, because you have already proven more than once that you're either unable to understand what one posts and/or dishonest.)

---

[7] Hyperlink:
http://ar.wikisource.org/wiki/%D8%AF%D8%B1%D8%A1_%D8%AA%D8%B9%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%B6_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D9%82%D9%84_%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%86%D9%82%D9%84/4

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Well, that's what I said. Ash`aris and the anthropomorphists are the same in the sense that the first thing that comes to their minds when readings the verses and Hadith on Sifat is Jihah, Jismiyyah, Tashbih, etc.

You may be doing this by purpose, making it seem I am writing to a brick wall, but that does not help your cause. Have the Ash'aris anywhere said that the first thing that comes to their minds when reading the verses is jihah, jismiyya, tashbih?

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> I'm not sure who before Fudah - whom you eventually just had to cite from - ever said that the Ash`ari Usul of "ظواهر نصوص الصفات تستلزم الجهة والجسمية" is stated onlyTanazzulan.

I wonder if you read the section I referred to? Here in the passage, you quote "zawahir al-nusus" means the "literal meaning" of the texts, not what comes to the mind. I have made the distinction between these two meanings of zahir very clear, yet you ignore what was written. Fudah quotes Ibn al-Humam who said what we reject is: "مما ظاهره الجسمية فى الشاهد" - its apparent meaning is jismiyyah in the what we see. It is not the zahir that comes to the mind, but the zahir of the words in created objects that is rejected.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> The problem with this understanding is that it is at odds with the understanding the Salaf possessed. Never once did they feel the need move away from the Lughah when these words were used for Allah. This is a

> fundamental point of difference that I feel is irreconcilable.

Well then let me ask you, do you accept the lughawi literal meaning of the attributes for Allah, like saaq? If so, then that is easy to verify: Just look at what the dictionaries say. Do you accept the dictionary definitions of those words for Allah? If yes, please say so. If no, then what is the problem with Ash'aris negating them?

And since you promote the lughawi, literal, meanings of these words, how can you possibly label the person whose beliefs I described an innovator, when he did just that??!!

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> On the specifics of Istiwa being reinterpreted as Tadbir, that may have worked - even that's a stretch - in the Hud verse, but where the word Tadbir is not found like in Taha, it is difficult to assume that Tadbir is intended. The Salaf emphatically affirmed Istiwa as a standalone attribute and did not reinterpret it with Tadbir. It's a similar case with Yad.

It's not interpreted. It's what comes to the mind when reading the verse. Even in English we say "the king ascended the throne" although he did not literally sit on the throne. It simply means he assumed sovereignty. Furthermore, the verses of the Qur'an explain each other. Why is there a problem with understanding what is in TaHa with what is in Hud? My point is simply the zahir that comes to the mind when reading the verse is definitely not kufr for a Muslim of sound aqidah.

As for what the Salaf accepted as an attribute, that is where we do tafweed.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> As I mentioned, the Zahir is how the Salaf understood these verses to be. They didn't imply Makan, Jihah and all these other innovated terms from the Nusus.

I am not talking about terms, but beliefs. Now we have a clear definition of Zahir from you: the Zahir is how the Salaf understood these verses to be. So, let me ask you based on this: Do you believe the Ash'aris believed the Salaf to be kuffar? Since the Zahir of the verses is what the Salaf understood, and according to the Ash'aris the zahir is kufr. Seriously?

And why is makan and jihah innovated terms? Ayna includes the meaning of makan (Ibn Uthaymin: " واستفهام النبي -صلى الله عليه وسلم- بـ "أين الله" يدل على أن لله مكاناً، ولكن يجب أن نعلم أن الله لا تحيط به الأمكنة لأنه أكبر من كل شيء"), and pointing upwards the meaning of jihah.

Is Ibn Uthaymin a mubtadi?

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> And by the way, they do say using all these terms is a Bid`ah, so please stop misquoting them.

They say the *terms* are bid'ah not the meanings.

Now, on behalf of that poor soul who you have labelled an innovator, when he only did what IT told him to, you have not answered his ishkal at all. You say:

"As thus, his faulty understanding of the Nusus is to blame, not Ibn Taymiyyah or other scholars"

How did he misunderstand the Nusus? Has he not accepted the literal meaning of the "sifat"?

Hasan Saleem:

And I forgot to mention, you failed to "contextualise" IT's quote for me where he says Allah is mahdood from the 6 directions.

QUESTIONS BY HH TO HS

Harris Hammam:

Following on from here:

Questions by HS to HH[8]

My first question is this:

When the people of Jannah will see their Creator with their very own eyes, will they be able to point to their Creator as well?

Hasan Saleem:

The Dhat of Allah cannot be physically pointed at as it is not located in a place.

Harris Hammam:

So, it is entirely possible according to you that two people in Jannah are looking at each other and at the same time 'seeing' Allah `Azza Wa-Jall?

[8] This is referring to the forum thread reproduced in the first section of this document

Hasan Saleem:

I didn't say that

Harris Hammam:

I'm asking what is possible

So, since according to you Ru'yah is merely a heightened perception of Allah sensed with the eyes (please also provide the Arabic for this expression), it is entirely possible that ten people in Jannah are sitting in a circle with nothing in between and they will be 'seeing' Allah in spite of this. Is Ru'yah possible like this according to you?

Hasan Saleem:

Let me quote to you what Imam al-Bayhaqi said in his book, ***al-I'tiqad,*** in which he has a whole section on ru'yah:

قال الشيخ الإمام أحمد رحمه الله: سمعت الشيخ الإمام أبا الطيب سهل بن محمد بن سليمان رحمه الله يقول فيما أملاه علينا في قوله: لا تضامون في رؤيته بضم التاء وتشديد الميم: يريد لا تجتمعون لرؤيته في جهته، ولا يضم بعضكم إلى بعض لذلك، فإنه عز وجل لا يرى في جهة كما يرى المخلوق في جهة، ومعناه بفتح التاء لا تضامون لرؤيته مثل معناه بضمها، ل تتضامون في رؤيته بالإجتماع في جهة وهو دون تشديد الميم من الضيم معناه: لا تظلمون في رؤيته برؤية بعضكم دون بعض، وأنكم ترونه في جهاتكم كلها، وهو يتعالى عن جهة، قال: والتشبيه برؤية القمر ليقين الرؤية دون تشبيه المرئي، تعالى الله عن ذلك علوا كبيرا

"I heard Shaykh Imam Abut Tayyib Sahl ibn Muhammad ibn Sulayman [al-Sa'luki] (may Allah have mercy on him) say in that which he dictated to us regarding his saying, "you will not huddle together to see Him": he means you will not huddle together to see Him in His direction, and one of you will not join to the other for that, as He will not be seen in a direction as creation is seen in a direction...You will see Him in all your directions, and He is beyond direction. He said: The comparison with seeing the moon is for the

certainty of seeing not a comparison of that which is seen, exalted is Allah beyond that with great exaltation."

As for Arabic expression, for example 'Ala al-Din al-Bukhari said in his Risalah fil I'tiqad:

اعلم أن رؤية الله تعالى بمعنى الانكشاف التام بالأبصار للمؤمنين فى الآخرة بعد دخولهم الجنة جائزة عقلا وواجبة سمعا فيرى لا في مكان ولا في جهة ولا اتصال شعاع ولا ثبوت مسافة بين الرائي وبينه تعالى وغير ذلك من أمارات الحدث

"Know that Ruy'ah in the meaning of a complete opening-up by means of the sights of believers in the afterlife after their entrance into Jannah is possible rationally and necessary textually, so He will be seen, neither in a place, nor in a direction..." (p. 139)

The "opening-up" as the editor of the book mentioned in the footnote is a perception that is acquired by the eyes more complete than what we have through knowledge, reason and reports. So, the "complete" that al-Bukhari is referring to is in reference to the inkishaf itself, not the reality of Allah.

Harris Hammam:

This confirms what I thought. People in Jannah will by looking in any place or direction and at the same time will 'perceive' Allah.

All what the Ash`ari version of Ru'yah means is that the people of Jannah will gain more knowledge of Allah through their eyes. At no moment in time will they actually see their Creator, there will be no إلى ربها ناظرة (unless one distorts the verse), and all what they will see is some created image or information in their minds - which obviously is Makhluq and hence is not Allah.

If one analyses Moses's story when he asked to see Allah on the mountain, it becomes apparent that he wasn't asking for a heightened perception of Allah through the eyes. This is clear

Tahrif and distortion of that story if we are to interpret his request for Nazr (أنظر إليك, لن تراني and فسوف تراني) like that. Furthermore, the Tajalli of Allah on the mountain, shattering it to pieces, confirms Ru'yah isn't merely about gaining a heightened perception of Allah through the eyes.

But let's move on slightly: The Ash`ari interpretation isn't the general belief of laymen vis-a-vis Allah. They believe they will see Allah their Creator in front of their eyes, not some created image in their head or increased knowledge. What do Ash`aris say about laymen who believe in the Zahir of Ru'yah, not some Ta'wil version aka الانكشاف التام? Are they wrong in such a belief? Be honest and tell us what you say about them, just like Ash`aris are honest when they say most Muslim laymen are Fussaq or incorrect believers for not doing pre-Iman Nazr.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> This confirms what I thought. People in Jannah will by looking in any place or direction and at the same time will 'perceive' Allah.

Just because they can turn to any direction (as Allah is not in a direction), it doesn't necessarily mean they will be looking at anything else besides Allah. Only Allah knows how this will transpire.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> All what the Ash`ari version of Ru'yah means is that the people of Jannah will gain more knowledge of Allah through their eyes.

Except that the Ash'aris explicitly say it is not mere knowledge. Knowledge is located in the mind or heart. Sight is located in the eyes.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> At no moment in time will they actually see their Creator, there will be no إلى ربها ناظرة (unless one distorts the verse), and all what they will see is some created image or information in their minds - which obviously is Makhluq and hence is not Allah.

They will perceive Allah with their eyes bila kayf. There is no distortion in this of the verse. What you mentioned, that is your hissi interpretation. No Ash'ari said some image will be created or information will be created in their minds. Nor is this a lazim of what they say.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> This is clear Tahrif and distortion of that story if we are to interpret his request for Nazr (أنظر إليك, لن تراني and فسوف تراني) like that. Furthermore, the Tajalli of Allah on the mountain, shattering it to pieces, confirms Ru'yah isn't merely about gaining a heightened perception of Allah through the eyes.

What was the tajalli, we do not know. The tajalli had to take place for the Ru'yah to happen (فإن استقر مكانه فسوف تراني). This much we know. Some phenomenal transformations will probably also have to take place in Janna for believers to be able to have Ru'yah of Allah. There is no Tahrif, merely Tafwid.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> The Ash`ari interpretation isn't the general belief of laymen vis-a-vis Allah. They believe they will see Allah

> their Creator in front of their eyes, not some created image in their head or increased knowledge.

Ash'aris don't believe they will some created image in their head or increased knowledge. You are putting words in their mouths, or making something a lazim of their madhhab which is not. As Isma'ili said the Salaf believe in Ru'yah without corporealism and without assuming boundaries for Allah. And Tahawi said without kayfiyyah.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> What do Ash`aris say about laymen who believe in the Zahir of Ru'yah, not some Ta'wil version aka الانكشاف التام?

Laymen need to learn Ru'yah will be without direction, opposition, distance etc. Read Iljam al-Awamm of Imam al-Ghazali. He tells you exactly what a layman must do with regards to the attributes of Allah. It is a wonderful read.

Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Be honest and tell us what you say about them, just like Ash`aris are honest when they say most Muslim laymen are Fussaq or incorrect believers for not doing pre-Iman Nazr

I know contemporary Ash'ari who has problem with this Ash'arite theory that the layman muqallid is sinful. The correct view is he is not sinful insha'allah.

Hasan Saleem:

Imam al-Ghazali also makes the same point about Ru'yah in a detailed section of his al-Iqtisad fil I'tiqad (his masterpiece on

'Aqidah). Please read his clear discussion (starting from فلنبحث عن الحقيقة ما هي؟) translated below:

> "We should therefore discuss the reality (of Ru'yah) what is it? It has no reality but that it is a type of perception, which is a more complete and a greater disclosure in relation to imagination. For example, we see a friend and then shut our eyes, so the image of the friend is present in our brain in the sense of imagination and conceptualisation. But if we opened the eye, we would perceive a difference. That difference is not due to perceiving an image different to what was in the imagination. Rather, the image that was seen is in conformity to the one imagined without difference. So, there is no distinction between them, except that this second state is like a completion for the state of imagination and is like an opening-up of it. So, when opening the eye, an image of the friend is created in a way that is more clear, complete and perfect...Hence, imagination is a type of perception at a level, and beyond it is another level which is more complete than it in clarity and disclosure, and is like a completion of it. So, we call this completion with respect to the imagination: Ru'yah and Ibsar.
>
> "Similarly, there are some things which we know but we cannot imagine, which is the essence of Allah and His attributes, and everything that doesn't have a form, meaning no colour and no size, like power, knowledge, love, sight and imagination. These are things we know but do not imagine. Knowledge of them is a kind of perception. So, we should contemplate: Does the intellect ('aql) find it impossible that this perception

can be more complete - its relation to it (meaning the more complete perception's relation to knowledge) is like the relation of seeing to imagination? If that is possible, we refer to that disclosure and completion in relation to knowledge: Ru'yah, like we referred to it in relation to imagination: Ru'yah. It is known that the possibility of this completion in opening-up and disclosure is not impossible in known things that exist which are not imagined, like knowledge, power etc. and likewise, in the essence and attributes of Allah (Most High)...So we say that is not impossible, as there is nothing making it impossible, but 'aql is proof of its possibility...However, this completion in disclosure is not expended in this world, while the soul is in the occupation of the body and the impurity of its attributes, so because of it, it (complete disclosure) is hidden to him. Just as it is not farfetched that the eyelid or a screen or a stain in the eye is a cause - according to the normal course of nature - of the impossibility of viewing imagined things, so it is not farfetched that the impurity of the self and the overloading of the veils of occupations - according to the normal course of nature - prevents viewing (ibsar) of known things. So, when what is in the graves are scattered...and the hearts are purified by pure drink...it is not impossible that because of it, it becomes ready for greater completion and perception of the essence of Allah (Most High). Since in all known things, the elevation of its level from the recognised type of knowledge is like the elevation of the level of sight from imagination, this is expressed as meeting Allah (Most High), witnessing Him, seeing Him, and observing Him, or whatever expression you

> please, as there is no tenacity in that after the meanings are made clear.
>
> "When that is possible, when this reality is created in the eye, the term Ru'yah in terms of the applicability of language to it is even more true. Creating it in the eye is not impossible, just as creating it in the heart is not impossible. Once it is understood what the people of truth intend by Ru'yah, it is known that the intellect does not find it impossible, but necessary as the Shari'ah attests to it, so there is no room for disagreement except by obstinacy or tenacity in using the term Ru'yah or deficiency in understanding these subtle meanings we described. We should limit ourself to this quantity in this summary."

Alhamdulillah, his discussion beautifully explains what I had in my mind and what I tried to convey above. Towards the end of his discussion on Ru'yah, Imam al-Ghazali says (from: ولينظر المنصف كيف افترقت الفرق)

> "Let the fair person consider how the splinter groups divided, and parted into the extremist and the negligent:
>
> "As for the Hashawiyyah, they were not able to understand something that exists which is not in a direction, so they affirmed direction, so by necessity, corporealism, measurement, and having the qualities of temporality became necessary for them. As for the Mu'tazilah, they negated direction, and they were not able to affirm Ru'yah without it, and because of it they opposed the absolute decrees of Shari'ah, and they

> believed that in affirming it (Ru'yah) there is affirmation of direction.
>
> "These (Mu'tazilah) became immersed in tanzih trying to avoid tashbih, so they were negligent. And the Hashawiyyah affirmed direction, trying to avoid ta'til so they made (Allah) similar [to creation]. So, Allah guided the Ahlus Sunnah to establish the truth. So, they acquired the middle path, and they knew that direction is negated, because it is a complement and completion of corporealism, and that Ru'yah is established, because it is a passenger of knowledge and its close relative, and it (Ru'yah) is a completion of it (knowledge). Hence, negation of corporealism necessitated the negation of direction which is from its necessites. And the establishment of knowledge necessitated the establishment of Ru'yah which is from its follow-ups and completors and shares with it in its quality which is that it does not necessitate any change in the essence of the object that is seen, but pertains to it as it is, like knowledge. It is not hidden to the intelligent person that this is moderation in belief (iqtisad fil i'tiqad)."

Student of Knowledge:

Salaam,

Can I ask a bit of a layman's question here?

The fact the Ru'yah of Allah 'azza wa jall is with the eyes follows from which evidences exactly?

Nass or Dalalah of Qur'an

Nass or Dalalah of Hadith

Confirmed Ijma'

Philological implication of the term Ru'yah

More than one of the above

something else - i.e., rational implication

I would be grateful to anyone who can offer a fleshed-out answer or perspective on this to help fill in some of the stepping stones that lead to the present discussion. Jazakallahu Khairan.

Student of Knowledge:

On a different matter, hinted at by HH above, there does seem to be some valid nuance to the question of how the Asha'irah view the issue of Nadhr on the one hand and Tasdiq, Iman, Ilm, Ma'rifah etc on the other. It doesn't seem that there is a unified stance among them; and we know that similar disparities can be found among other factions. Thus, Qadhi Abu Ya'la is noted as having a quasi-rationalist stance on Nadhr, while al-Ghazali in his 'Iljam notes prudently that the majority of Muslims, including those who are learned don't possess the type of Nadhr that warrants the qualification of unfailing proof and demonstration - there being the possibility that in a given age of the Ummah, there may not be a single person who has this standing. Aside from the primary works themselves, Richard M Frank has a useful article, "Knowledge and Taqlid: The Foundations of Religious Belief in Classical Ash'arism."

Let's be careful not to run a polemic against one side or the other. It's much more useful to get an accurate depiction of the geography of a given view with respect to which of the scholars and madhahib hold it and whether it is a matter within which there are nuances. I don't think it can be credibly said that Ash'arism in some monolithic way demands that doubt must precede genuine faith, or

faith not grounded in sophisticated proof is null or grossly deficient.

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Student of Knowledge:]

> Salaam,
>
> Can I ask a bit of a layman's question here?
>
> The fact the Ru'yah of Allah 'azza wa jall is with the eyes follows from which evidences exactly?
>
> Nass or Dalalah of Qur'an
>
> Nass or Dalalah of Hadith
>
> Confirmed Ijma'
>
> Philological implication of the term Ru'yah
>
> More than one of the above
>
> something else - i.e., rational implication
>
> I would be grateful to anyone who can offer a fleshed-out answer or perspective on this to help fill in some of the stepping stones that lead to the present discussion. Jazakallahu Khairan.

I think it might be "all of the above", dalalah of verses of Qur'an, nass of hadiths (as there is riwayah with 'ayanan), ijma and the linguistic & ontological import of the words/realities of ru'yah/nazr. Here is what al-Ghazali says:

وقد دل الشرع على وقوعه، ومداركه كثيرة، ولكثرته يمكن دعوى الإجماع على الأولين فى ابتهالهم إلى الله سبحانه في طلب لذة النظر إلى وجهه الكريم، ونعلم قطعا من عقائدهم أنهم كانوا ينتظرون ذلك، وأنهم كانوا قد فهموا جواز انتظار ذلك وسؤاله من الله تعالى بقرائن أحوال رسول

الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وجملة من ألفاظه الصريحة التي لا تدخل فى الحصر، والإجماع يدل على خروج المدارك عن الحصر.

ومن أقوى ما يدل عليه: قول موسى عليه السلام: أرني أنظر إليك، فإنه يستحيل أن يخفى على نبي من أنبياء الله تعالى انتهى منصبه إلى يكلمه الله سبحانه شفاها، فيجهل من صفات ذاته تعالى ما عرفه المعتزلة...!

> "The Shariah proves it will occur, and its evidences are many, and because of its abundance, it can be claimed the earlier ones were unanimous in their supplication to Allah (Subhanah) in asking for the pleasure of looking at His noble countenance, and we know for certain that it was from their beliefs that they anticipated that, and that they understood the permissibility of anticipating that and asking it from Allah (Most High) by indications from the conditions of the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu'alayhiwasallam), and a collection of his clear words which do not enter into a limit. The consensus shows the evidences are beyond limitation. One of the strongest evidences is Musa ('alayhissalam)'s statement: 'show to me, that I may look at You.' As it is impossible for it to be hidden to a prophet from amongst the prophets of Allah (Most High) whose status culminated at Allah (subhanah) speaking to him directly that he is ignorant of an attribute of His essence which the Mu'tazilah are privy to!..."

Al-Bayhaqi too has a good discussion on evidences in his al-I'tiqad.

Do you know how I can get a copy of Richard Frank's "Knowledge and Taqlid: The Foundations of Religious Belief in Classical Ash'arism."? Jazakallah

Harris Hammam:

I have three further questions at this point.

1.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Only Allah knows how this will transpire.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> They will perceive Allah with their eyes bila kayf.

You say how, then you say Bi-La Kayf, which according to you implies the total negation of howness. Can you care to explain this apparent self-contradiction?

2. When the Quran says وجوه يومئذ ناضرة إلى ربها ناظرة, and when the Prophet peace be upon him tells the Muslims النظر إلى وجه الله عز وجل when doing the Tafsir of للذين أحسنوا الحسنى وزيادة (Al-Ru'yah, al-Daraqutni, no. 156), without any Kalami restrictions upon how a Muslim should believe in this article of faith, do you:

a. say exactly what the Quran and Sunnah say and leave it at that,

b. or add your Kalami restrictions on this lest the Muslims are not duped into the Kufr of Zahir passively promoted by Kitab and Sunnah as per Ash`ari principles?

That's a or b.

3. Do you honestly believe that the vast majority of Muslims believe in Ru'yah in the manner Ash`aris believe in?

4.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Laymen need to learn Ru'yah will be without direction, opposition, distance etc. Read Iljam al-Awamm of

> Imam al-Ghazali. He tells you exactly what a layman must do with regards to the attributes of Allah. It is a wonderful read.

How are laymen being taught the Ash`ari belief in Ru'yah? What steps do Islamic school take to ensure that Muslim kids and the ordinary laymen believe that Ru'yah merely means Inkishaf, and that they must also believe that فيرى لا في مكان ولا في جهة ولا اتصال شعاع ولا ثبوت مسافة بين الرائي وبينه تعالى.

5. The verse of al-Qiyamah says وجوه يومئذ ناضرة, and in the following verse إلى ربها ناظرة. The implication is that faces will be looking towards their Lord. In other words, the whole facial area will be in witness to their Creator. How does that sit with the Ash`ari version of Ru'yah that suggests that it is only an experience within the eyes?

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> You say how, then you say Bi-La Kayf, which according to you implies the total negation of howness. Can you care to explain this apparent self-contradiction?

By "how" I meant the exact reality of the Ru'yah. We can't possibly know that until (insha'allah) we experience it. Bila Kayf means no jihah, masafah, muqabalah, etc. as in commonly experienced forms of Ru'yah.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> When the Quran says وجوه يومئذ ناضرة إلى ربها ناظرة, and when the Prophet peace be upon him tells the Muslims when doing the Tafsir of للذين أحسنوا الحسنى وزيادة (Al-Ru'yah, al-Daraqutni, no. 156), **without** النظر إلى وجه الله عز وجل

> **any Kalami restrictions upon how a Muslim should believe in this article of faith, do you:**
>
> **a. say exactly what the Quran and Sunnah say and leave it at that,**
>
> **b. or add your Kalami restrictions on this lest the Muslims are not duped into the Kufr of Zahir passively romoted by Kitab and Sunnah as per Ash`ari principles?**
>
> **That's a or b.**

As Imam al-Bayhaqi explained in Manaqib al-Shafi'i, the use of Kalam and its principles is based on need. In later times there was a need that wasn't in earlier times.

Furthermore, "zahir" is used in more than one meaning. "Zahir" in the meaning of "literal meaning" is certainly negated in certain verses e.g., huwa ma'akum aynama kuntum. "Zahir" in the meaning of "what comes to the mind of the listener" - is ambiguous and depends on context, time, people. For Sunni Ash'aris, the zahir in this sense is never kufr.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Do you honestly believe that the vast majority of Muslims believe in Ru'yah in the manner Ash`aris believe in?

They must believe in Ru'yah without tajsim, without tahdid, without jihah, without kayfiyyah, as clear from Isma'ili's and Tahawi's statements. Beyond that, there is no obligation on the layman to understand exactly how this will happen.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> How are laymen being taught the Ash`ari belief in Ru'yah? What steps do Islamic school take to ensure that Muslim kids and the ordinary laymen believe that Ru'yah merely means Inkishaf

With basic Sunni belief as encapsulated in for example, Tahawiyyah, Nasafiyyah, Jawharah, etc. which explicitly or implicitly say Allah is not a physical body, in a physical location, with physical dimensions. Therefore, a misconception of Ru'yah as the commonly experienced one with jihah etc. is taught against, no matter how much you dislike it.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> The verse of al-Qiyamah says وجوه يومئذ ناضرة, and in the following verse إلى ربها ناظرة. The implication is that faces will be looking towards their Lord. In other words, the whole facial area will be in witness to their Creator. How does that sit with the Ash`ari version of Ru'yah that suggests that it is only an experience within the eyes?

The eyes are situated in the faces so the faces will be looking at their Lord by inclusion. When you say "he saw that", it does not mean his entire body did the seeing. His eyes did the seeing. But his body may react to that sense. Similarly, the faces become resplendent upon seeing their Lord.

Student of Knowledge:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> I think it might be "all of the above", dalalah of verses of Qur'an, nass of hadiths (as there is riwayah with

> 'ayanan), ijma and the linguistic & ontological import of the words/realities of ru'yah/nazr.

Let me rehearse some thoughts.

I think the discussion here can be taken back to some core issues – this is something I was advocating earlier in the previous thread. In particular, we can first look at the issue of belief and make an important distinction between:

(1) What justifies a common Muslim assenting to a belief, and;

(2) What justifies the belief itself

I would argue that the criteria for (1) are different to the criteria for (2). With respect to (1), if we look at the reasons for why most people adhere to the beliefs they do, it is commonly due to;

(3) The dynamic weight of religious authority in the public sphere

(4) An attempt at reasoned preference

As for (3) it is not considered a proof on its own merit, and (4) is obviously to be discounted because the semblance of a proof is not a proof. This latter mode is in fact what proceeds from most students who consider themselves to be producing and evaluating real arguments according to genuine standards.

In summary, it is clear that (1) above is grounded in taqlid, even if not evident taqlid. This taqlid is sufficient for the average person, on the most accepted view – i.e., Ghazali, as I mentioned before – but this cannot be satisfactory criteria for (2). So (2), justifying the belief in the first, place must go back to the more basic questions,

(Q1) What are the sources of knowledge in Islam, and;

(Q2) What are the interpretive tools at our disposal?

These questions naturally lead to a discussion of the relationship between those sources of knowledge traditionally referred to as manqul and ma'qul. The relationship between these types of sources is highly nuanced and we have the Dar al-Ta'arud of ibn Taymiyya as a good example of a kalam work trying to tease out the relationship between the two. On this present issue of Ru'yah, this same background reflection cannot be sidelined without undermining the enterprise itself and taking it towards a taqlidi dispute as opposed to an argued conclusion supported by acceptable method and content.

Transmitted Sources

The transmitted sources of knowledge which are taken to be definitive are typically reckoned three;

(i) The Qur'an

(ii) The sound Hadith

(iii) Unequivocal 'Ijma

Other proofs which are less definitive are also given consideration but the type of knowledge they confer is not of the same standing.

It is important to note at this stage that it is the **textual content** of these three sources which are definitive and **not the interpretive philosophy** that is applied to them. As we move to consider the latter, we have begun the move towards the ma'qul. That is to say, our evaluation of the transmitted sources is centrally dependent on the hermeneutical techniques we choose to employ. This interpretive philosophy, robust enough to help solve questions like this present one on Ru'yah, is and has always been an evolving conversation. Important issues include:

1. How do we determine the import of a text?

2. What techniques allow us to make implications which go beyond the text?

3. How do we decide what words mean – this leads to questions of reference between word and object

4. What theory of literal or figurative meaning we accept etc.

The important thing here is that the correct response to each question is not something axiomatic or axiomatically inferable from these three sources themselves. Rather, one's position must be argued for and then accepted or rejected based on its credibility or reasonableness.

One example of such an issue is the discussion surrounding the apparent meaning of a text. On a pragmatic theory of language, words do not have meaning intrinsically or atomically. Thus, determining the meaning of a word relates to the intent of the speaker against a background of socially available linguistic knowledge. For an introduction to this approach, I would recommend reading, "Philosophy of Language: a contemporary introduction" by William Lycan; particularly chapters, 7, 11 and 13. What can be seen from contemporary works in the philosophy of language is that ideas similar to those discussed in classical kalam works are importantly developed in light of sustained academic analysis as well as further empirical study. With respect to metaphor, for example, we can learn from corpus linguistics that the idea of metaphorical usage as a deviation from standard literal intent is a misrepresentation of the aims of language users and the nature in which language actually presents itself in ordinary contexts.

Non-transmitted (Rational) Sources

The rational enterprise has moved on a long way since the period of classical authorship. Consider two simple yet profound examples;

(A) The invention of a wholly distinct theory of formal logic in the modern sentential and predicate calculus.

(B) The 'invention' of science as an empirically driven mode of practice where theories of ontology demand empirical support to hold credence.

Let's consider (B) with respect to the present discussion on Ru'yah. In this regard, the science and philosophy of perception may help to give us important insights when discussing the modality of perception – what has been under discussion in these preceding posts. What does it mean to see something and what does it necessitate rationally or empirically or both?

Examine the question: does seeing something necessitate a locus for the "object" of perception? It is being assumed in part that it does. Now this is not to say that there can't be other important reasons to believe that something being seen requires a locus in a geographic sense – a direction. It is simply to ask whether perception requires an object and whether that object must be situated somewhere. This is a complicated question for which I can only hint towards some worthwhile points that need to be considered when working out a solution.

Perception, or seeing, is not restrictively a veridical enterprise. This is just a formal way of saying that the perceptual experience is not only produced along a single causal path. It will help to understand this if we remember that it is not the eye that sees but rather the mind - via the brain in our material existence here on earth.

[Side note: we know that perception is a mental phenomenon, yet textually it is the eye which is said to see. This further illustrates how our textual interpretive philosophy will need to account for language being used in this way, unless we want to say that literally the eye on its own sees – is the eye the locus of our perceptual experience?]

One of the causal pathways for sight is the presence of an extra-mental object which has a dimensional presence in the world. This object, in some causal way, induces a perception of it. i.e., what we normally call "seeing."

An ontologically distinct form of perceptual experience can be seen in cases of hallucination. Empirically, it is no disputed matter that people whose physiology is different to the norm can be prone to have perceptual experiences to which no extra-mental object corresponds. Perceptions which interestingly involve the eyes acting in exactly the same way as if the perception was veridical. We still call this seeing – one might say "Jim sees things that aren't there." [surprisingly this gives us a scenario where seeing takes a direction, but doesn't put the object of perception in a direction.]

The above discussion shows that a naive theory of perception can lead one to conclude that seeing is purely a veridical enterprise – seeing a thing 'out there' and because it's 'out there' other things logically follow. I would begin by challenging the idea that "seeing" is always to be interpreted as "out there" in a way that requires direction. One example in the material world is what I mentioned above. This allows us to see that the ontology of perception is broader and can potentially include different causal pathways, that result in what would still be called perception or seeing, but of an ontologically different type.

In summary, I have highlighted that there is a distinction between transmitted sources of knowledge – sources believed because of who said them; and rational sources – sources believed because of what is said. The latter includes one's hermeneutical philosophy which has an intimate and inseparable connection to the transmitted sources, as well as arguments grounded in reason and science. The rational sources are not subject to taqlid and correspond on the state of a subject in any given time. This places a challenge on both parties to demonstrate that their rational framework lives up to the state of the art.

This very brief and selective exposition is designed to illustrate one way to look at the types of analysis that I think need to form part of one's analytic framework in matters of kalam. It's a very limited and casual attempt to do that, so I apologise for the level of readability in what I've written.

Harris Hammam:

Jazakallah, these are interesting responses. I'm going to provide some of my brief thoughts before I move on quickly to my next question. After all, the readers decide - can't force them to accept anything.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> By "how" I meant the exact reality of the Ru'yah. We can't possibly know that until (insha'allah) we experience it. Bila Kayf means no jihah, masafah, muqabalah, etc. as in commonly experienced forms of Ru'yah.

There's no common ground between us on how Kayf is understood. According to you, Kayf means jihah, masafah,

muqabalah etc. According to me, Kayf is the Qadr Mumayyiz, whereas the Ma`na is the Qadr Mushtarik.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> As Imam al-Bayhaqi explained in Manaqib al-Shafi'i, the use of Kalam and its principles is based on need. In later times there was a need that wasn't in earlier times.

Yes, I know - al-Bayhaqi was an Ash`ari, رحمه الله.

We maintain that al-Shafi`i's stance against Kalam is applicable until Qiyamah.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Furthermore, "zahir" is used in more than one meaning. "Zahir" in the meaning of "literal meaning" is certainly negated in certain verses e.g., huwa ma'akum aynama kuntum. "Zahir" in the meaning of "what comes to the mind of the listener" - is ambiguous and depends on context, time, people. For Sunni Ash'aris, the zahir in this sense is never kufr.

For Ash`aris, the Zahir is Kufr - full stop. That is why they do Tafwid (we don't know) or Ta'wil (let's provide an alternative suitable meaning).

The Zahir is relative from person to person. The only Zahir that is the Haqq is the one that is understood by the Salaf. Verses like وهو معكم أينما كنتم are Zahir in denoting Allah's knowledge of everything according to the Salaf. This isn't Ta'wil according to us. Maybe according to you guys, the Zahir is Kufr and the Tafsir بعلمه is Ta'wil.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Originally Posted by HH:]
>
> > Do you honestly believe that the vast majority of Muslims believe in Ru'yah in the manner Ash`aris believe in?
>
> They must believe in Ru'yah without tajsim, without tahdid, without jihah, without kayfiyyah, as clear from Isma'ili's and Tahawi's statements. Beyond that, there is no obligation on the layman to understand exactly how this will happen.

Thank you for dodging the question. Let's leave it at that.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Originally Posted by HH:]
>
> How are laymen being taught the Ash`ari belief in Ru'yah? What steps do Islamic school take to ensure that Muslim kids and the ordinary laymen believe that Ru'yah merely means Inkishaf[, and that they must also believe that فيرى لا في مكان ولا في جهة ولا اتصال شعاع ولا ثبوت مسافة بين الرائي وبينه تعالى.]
>
> With basic Sunni belief as encapsulated in for example, Tahawiyyah, Nasafiyyah, Jawharah, etc. which explicitly or implicitly say Allah is not a physical body, in a physical location, with physical dimensions. Therefore, a misconception of Ru'yah as the commonly experienced one with jihah etc. is taught against, no matter how much you dislike it.

I know you're not going to even answer how many kids and laymen actually study these books (and in the case of Tahawiyyah:

according to the Mutakallimun interpretation), because I know you won't give a straight answer. But let me add a point: I've been TJ many times, and I've heard dozens of people talking about the Ru'yah of Allah and this amazing bounty in Jannah - I don't ever recollect people ever making this out to be merely Inkishaf, without Jihah Muqabalah Masafah etc. It's quite clear that the overwhelming majority of the Ummah do not subscribe to the Ash`ari position on Ru'yah, rather they believe in it as it is without delving into the aspects the Ash`aris negate - and as I clarified, silence from negation of invented terms is the position of the Salaf, which normal laymen do but Ash`aris don't.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> The eyes are situated in the faces so the faces will be looking at their Lord by inclusion. When you say "he saw that", it does not mean his entire body did the seeing. His eyes did the seeing. But his body may react to that sense. Similarly, the faces become resplendent upon seeing their Lord.

I really don't see how a layman, when hearing that the Prophet peace be upon him said النظر إلى وجه الله عز وجل, would automatically subscribe to any article of the Ash`ari position in Ru'yah. I'm sure you would say they would need to be educated away from anthropomorphism, which is why the Kitab and Sunnah aren't enough - in fact are too dangerous - requiring books like Iljam and Jawharah and Nasafiyyah to school them on Ru'yah.

Of course, in the grand scheme of things, this happens nowhere in the Muslim world of laymen, والحمد لله.

Harris Hammam:

My next question is:

> Is the Khilaf between Ash`aris and Mu`tazilites on the Ru'yah Haqiqi or Lafzi? Is it of substance or merely semantics?

AbuIman_alMaghrabi:

According to the mutakalimun Allah ta'ala should have sent a philosopher as the last Messenger, maybe a Greek one, because they really behave that they can explain it much better, with better terminology and definition of terms as Allah ﷻ and his illiterate Messenger Muhammad ﷺ.

The message must be definitely incomplete from the perspective of the philosophers because they add explanations, page after page, which are outside of Quran wa Sunnah and not from Allah ta'ala and his Messenger.

And even if the philosophers were right, they must be the stupidest humans in the history of mankind, because they need explanations, page after page, what the unlearned illiterate desert Arabians immediately understand with one word.

Or they believe the Prophet and the Qur'an are merely the pictorial explanation for the stupid mass, and only this alleged mental Elite knows the true content, much better as the Messanger ﷺ and all the other unlearned illiterate sahaba رضي الله عنهم.

You cannot imagine how I hate this page-long philosophical chatter without exact going along pure ayat, without add or omit a dust grain.

Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee said,

"My ruling regarding the people of theological rhetoric is that they should be beaten with palm leaves and shoes and be paraded amongst the kinsfolk and the tribes with it being announced, 'This

is the reward of the one who abandons the Book (Qur'aan) and the Sunnah and turns to theological rhetoric (kalaam)."

Hasan Saleem:

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> We maintain that al-Shafi`i's stance against Kalam is applicable until Qiyamah.

If you read the section in reference from Manaqib al-Shafi'i, Imam al-Bayhaqi argues Imam al-Shafi'i himself engaged in a type of Kalam in his arguments against a Mu'tazili/Qadari. And when he spoke against Kalam, he spoke against the Kalam of the Mu'tazilah and Ahlul Bid'ah not mutlaq Kalam. Hafiz Ibn 'Asakir reiterates this point in his Tabyin Kadhib al-Muftari. Both Shafi'i masters of hadith, who know better about their Imam than you.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> For Ash`aris, the Zahir is Kufr - full stop.

Yes, when in the meaning of "literal meaning", like the example I gave (huwa ma'akum aynama kuntum). Why is it you're allowed to call something ambiguous (when it's not) and when I call something that really does have various meanings (i.e., zahir) ambiguous, suddenly it's "full stop" so that you can create the worst possible impression of Ash'aris.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> The Zahir is relative from person to person. The only Zahir that is the Haqq is the one that is understood by the Salaf. Verses like وهو معكم أينما كنتم are Zahir in denoting Allah's knowledge of everything according to the Salaf. This isn't Ta'wil according to us. Maybe

> according to you guys, the Zahir is Kufr and the Tafsir بعلمه is Ta'wil.

Like I said, it depends on how you define Zahir. Simple as that. So, now, according to you, zahir is the words of Qur'an *coupled* with the understanding of the Salaf, and is nothing intrinsic to the words of the Qur'an itself? Please clarify that this is your understanding, as it exposes the meaninglessness of your assertion, 'we can't accept that the zahir of the Qur'an is kufr' as in this meaning, who can???!!!!

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> It's quite clear that the overwhelming majority of the Ummah do not subscribe to the Ash`ari position on Ru'yah

The laymen of today are not a hujjah. Anyhow, I have made my points quite clear in earlier posts.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> I'm sure you would say they would need to be educated away from anthropomorphism, which is why the Kitab and Sunnah aren't enough - in fact are too dangerous - requiring books like Iljam and Jawharah and Nasafiyyah to school them on Ru'yah

What do you say of the Salaf who said الحديث مضلة إلا للفقهاء؟ The Qur'an and Sunnah must be understood in light of what the Salaf believed. Even you accept that. But it seems when convenient for you, you sidestep it to the emotional statement you mention here.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Is the Khilaf between Ash`aris and Mu`tazilites on the Ru'yah Haqiqi or Lafzi? Is it of substance or merely semantics?

It is Haqiqi as Mu'tazilah don't believe in a Ru'yah involving the eyes.

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Both Shafi'i masters of hadith, who know better about their Imam than you.

I wouldn't use that argument. All Madhhabs have masters of `Aqidah on both sides of the fence: Mutakallimun and Ahl 'l-Hadith, and there's a spectrum in between as well. There are Shafi`is who are both anti-Kalam and ascribe their theological positions to al-Shafi`i directly.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Yes, when in the meaning of "literal meaning", like the example I gave (huwa ma'akum aynama kuntum). Why is it you're allowed to call something ambiguous (when it's not) and when I call something that really does have various meanings (i.e., zahir) ambiguous, suddenly it's "full stop" so that you can create the worst possible impression of Ash'aris.

Because of what al-Taftazani said. On commenting on والنصوص تحمل على ظاهرها, he made the exception of those Nusus in which the Zahir gives an indication of Jismiyyah and Jihah. He didn't say "there are two Zahirs - one of Jismiyyah and Jihah, and another one that is truthful". After all, there is a reason why Ash`aris do Tafwid (we don't know) or Ta'wil (let's provide an alternative suitable meaning) and that's because the Zahir of such Nusus is Kufr

according to them. There is no mention of an alternative Zahir of such Nusus that is the Haqq. In fact, it would make little sense as affirming a Zahir would mean the meaning is known, which the Ash`aris simply don't do.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> The laymen of today are not a hujjah. Anyhow, I have made my points quite clear in earlier posts.

I know. It is quite clear from your statements that the overwhelming laymen are all major inadvertent innovators, in the issue of Ru'yah, and perhaps other articles of faith, namely the Kalam of Allah. If this were critical issues - and critical they are - we would have seen mass literature and content flooding the bookshops and the Internet advising Muslims on how to safeguard themselves from deviance in Ru'yah. We would have seen tonnes of lectures on this topic, explaining to laymen what Ru'yah is all about from an Ash`ari viewpoint. Where is all this happening? Zilch.

That is why the notion of Ash`aris being the majority of the Ummah will always be a myth. The Mutakallimun live in their own world.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> What do you say of the Salaf who said الحديث مضلة إلا للفقهاء? The Qur'an and Sunnah must be understood in light of what the Salaf believed. Even you accept that. But it seems when convenient for you, you sidestep it to the emotional statement you mention here.

There is a huge difference between the Salaf statement الحديث مضلة إلا للفقهاء and between the Mutakallimun saying الأخذ بظواهر الكتاب والسنة من أصول الكفر, but you've failed to understand it.

In the latter, the implication is that the Zahir of the Nusus in and of themselves are deviation, which must be averted via sidestepping (Tafwid or Ta'wil).

However, in the former, the implication is incomplete knowledge, i.e., knowledge of Hadith without Fiqh, is a place where people could make mistakes. Besides, the context of this statement is in regards to Ijtihad in Fiqh, not theology.

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> [Originally Posted by HH:]
>
> > Is the Khilaf between Ash`aris and Mu`tazilites on the Ru'yah Haqiqi or Lafzi? Is it of substance or merely semantics?
>
> It is Haqiqi as Mu'tazilah don't believe in a Ru'yah involving the eyes.

Ibn Taymiyyah said in Bayan Talbis 'l-Jahmiyyah that al-Razi's position on Ru'yah makes the difference between him and the Mu`tazilites almost Lafzi:

ولهذا يعترف هذا الرازي بأن النزاع بينهم وبين المعتزلة في الرؤية قريب من اللفظي فعلم ان هؤلاء حقيقة باطنهم باطن المعتزلة الجهمية المعطلة وإن كان ظاهرهم ظاهر اهل الاثبات

Sa`id Fudah agreed with this assessment on al-Razi and said:

وعلى كل حال، فالمؤلف لما نقل كلام الإمام الرازي بأن حقيقة الرؤية هي معرفة ضرورية، وهو حقيقة وتحقيق رأي الأشعري والأشاعرة جميعًا، قال بأن الخلاف حينئذٍ لفظي مع الأشاعرة، والتصريح بأن الخلاف لفظي فيه إنصاف بعد الظلم الذي أظهرنا وقوعَ المؤلف فيه

Fudah goes onto say:

ولنبين جهة الخلاف بالضبط، فقد سبق أن نقلنا عن القاضي عبد الجبار قوله بأن الخلاف إنما هو مع الأشاعرة، حتى زعم أنه لا خلاف بينهم وبين المجسمة، ونرى الشرفي ههنا يقول الخلاف مع الأشاعرة لفظي

At no point in time does he express in his thesis that the Khilaf with the Mu`tazilites is Haqiqi. Rather he defends the notion that this is all semantics and not very substantive. He further says:

والثانية: رؤية الله تعالى، فالاتفاق حاصل في هذه المسألة بين الأشاعرة والمعتزلة ومن وافقهم على أن رؤية الله تعالى إذا حصلت فلا يمكن أن تكون بحدّ ومقابلة، ولكن المعتزلة يسمون الحاصل علمًا، وإن سمي رؤية، والأشاعرة يقولون هو رؤية، والرؤية يرجع حاصل معناها في النهاية عندهم إلى المعرفة الضرورية، فالخلاف على هذا لفظي محض، ولكن الأشاعرة يقولون إن هذا الإدراك العلمي يسمى رؤية، وهو المقصود عند إطلاق الرؤية والمعتزلة ينكرون ذلك

And then:

إذن، ما ذكره المؤلف في هذه المسألة عمَّن سمَّاهم بالمتأخرين من الأشاعرة يوافق عليه هو، ويحكم على الخلاف بين الزيدية وبين الأشاعرة بناءً عليه بأنه خلافٌ لفظيٌّ، وهذا حَسَنٌ

The net result is that both Ash`aris and Mu`tazilis believe in Inkishaf and greater Ma`rifah of Allah as per the Ru'yah mentioned in the Quran - the only difference is that Ash`aris believe this will be via the eye and the Mu`tazilites believe it won't be via the eye. What can most certainly be extrapolated from these statements by Sa`id Fudah is that the Mu`tazilite position is not something worth condemning.

Do you agree with Sa`id Fudah's treatment of this issue, in which he clearly downplayed the difference between the Ash`aris and Mu`tazilites, and stated in multiple times the Khilaf in Ru'yah between the two positions is by in large Lafzi, with the net result being the same?

Source: http://www.aslein.net/showthread.php?t=1106

Hasan Saleem:

Re: Questions by HH to HS

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> There are Shafi`is who are both anti-Kalam and ascribe their theological positions to al-Shafi`i directly.

These are not ascriptions. Both Bayhaqi and Ibn 'Asakir quote with isnads, with explanation of his statements in light of all the reports.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> Because of what al-Taftazani said. On commenting on والنصوص تحمل على ظاهرها, he made the exception of those Nusus in which the Zahir gives an indication of Jismiyyah and Jihah. He didn't say "there are two Zahirs - one of Jismiyyah and Jihah, and another one that is truthful". After all, there is a reason why Ash`aris do Tafwid (we don't know) or Ta'wil (let's provide an alternative suitable meaning) and that's because the Zahir of such Nusus is Kufr according to them. There is no mention of an alternative Zahir of such Nusus that is the Haqq. In fact, it would make little sense as affirming a Zahir would mean the meaning is known, which the Ash`aris simply don't do.

As I wrote on the other thread:

> When Ash'aris negate zahir, it is in two meanings. As you quoted Fudah, you can see p. 77 onwards from his Naqd al-Tadmuriyyah where he discusses this issue (download here),[9] and refutes the very argument you

[9] Hyperlink:
http://www.4shared.com/office/KY3Pc4W6/_-_.htm

are making (in blind imitation of IT). The first meaning Ash'aris negate is what Ibn Kathir mentioned: the meaning that immediately comes to the mind of anthropomorphists, NOT the meaning that comes to the mind of Sunni Muslims - whose view about Allah are governed by the clear verses on tanzih, laysa kamithli shay, lam yakullahu kufwan ahad, hal ta'lamu lahu samiyya, lillahil mathalul a'la, and hadith laysa lahu shabihun wa la 'adl. Zahir is negated in this sense tanzzulan (meaning, for arguments sake accepting that this is the zahir as the mushabbihah say). Otherwise, the zahir certainly is not anthropomorphic. This is what is known as "zahir bid dalil" and Ash'aris certainly do not say that this is anthropomorphic! If they did, that would negate their entire madhhab (which is obviously what you and IT hope by saying this).

The other meaning of zahir, is zahir lughatan, meaning the literal and linguistic meaning assigned by the Arabs. Literal meaning of for example yad is a jarihah or 'udw. This meaning is certainly negated. When Ash'aris say we do either tafwid or ta'wil, it does not mean the meaning that immediately comes to the mind is kufr. There is no connection between the two. E.g., the meaning that comes to mind in for example istawa 'ala l-'arsh is that Allah assumed sovereignty by adminstering orders in the creation (tadbir) - and this is zahir (clear) from the context and language. Similarly, the meaning that comes in bal yadahu mabsutatan is that Allah is generous and gives abundantly. However,

> as an attribute of action or essence, istiwa and yad, their meanings are not known - this is where tafwid is done. The meaning that comes to the mind upon reading the verses is certainly not kufr. I hope that is clear to you now.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> It is quite clear from your statements that the overwhelming laymen are all major inadvertent innovators, in the issue of Ru'yah, and perhaps other articles of faith, namely the Kalam of Allah

How do you know the view of overwhelming laymen? If you want to make this claim then carry out a proper poll from a cross section of the Muslim communities. With the question, when experiencing Ru'yah of Allah will Allah be in a direction and will there be a specific distance between seer and seen?

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> At no point in time does he express in his thesis that the Khilaf with the Mu`tazilites is Haqiqi

Yes he does. He even quotes Qadi Abdul Jabbar (Mu'tazili) who said he has no disagreement with the Mujassimah, his disagreement is only with the Ash'aris!

As for the Haqiqi disagreement, he says:

وتحقيق المقام أن هناك مسألتين :

الأولى: مفهوم الرؤية وشروطه، والخلاف بين الأشاعرة وبين غيرهم من المعتزلة ومن وافقهم حقيقي معنوي؛ لأن المعتزلة يزعمون استحالة الرؤية إلا بالحاسة والمقابلة والحدّ، والأشاعرة يقولون: إن الرؤية يمكن أن يوجدها الله تعالى مباشرة في النفس أو العين، فتدركها النفس ولو بلا توسط شعاع ولا كون المرئي محدودًا ومقابلاً.

> This is a difference on the ontology (external reality) of Ru'yah. For Mu'tazilah, Ru'yah is inconceivable without ordinary aspects of sight like opposition and so on. Ash'aris argue Ru'yah ontologically (in reality) is possible in this way. Ghazali has also explained what is the reality of Ru'yah and how it is possible without these things ordinarily associated with sight in the passage I quoted earlier. Fudah says the ikhtilaf is haqiqi from one aspect (the ontology of Ru'yah) and lafzi from another aspect (whatever is described as 'Ru'yah' in the texts will not be with hadd, jihah etc.). I believe this disagreement over the haqiqah of Ru'yah is an important and substantital one between us and Mu'tazilah, as for the latter this is not Ru'yah in the true sense, whereas for Sunnis, it is Ru'yah; and the result of the Mu'tazili view is, as Ghazali said, ta'til.

Student of Knowledge:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> These are not ascriptions. Both Bayhaqi and Ibn 'Asakir quote with isnads, with explanation of his statements in light of all the reports.

Yes. In fairness, one would have to examine all the reports and place them within a historical method in order to accurately represent the mind-set and worldview of different scholars. If one is after a folkloric history then a single statement which helps bolster a romantic narrative that one is already convinced of will be enough for someone, but that surely falls short of academic integrity.

For example, we must consider al-Shafi'i's connection to Abu Khalid Muslim ibn Khalid ibn sa'id (al-Zanji) as well as Ibrahim ibn Abi Yahya. Both have been counted as Mu'tazila among their

biographers (i.e., ibn al-Murtada) - I believe al-Razi also mentioned the former being among them, and the case of Abi Yahya is not disputed. Obviously, we're talking about pre-canonization i'itizal since Abi Yahya studied with Abu-l Hudhayl who is generally considered the first to begin formulating a systematic position.

Then we also have to consider the students of al-Shafi'i such as al-Muzani and al-Karabisi, al-Muhasibi as well as the later Abu Thawr to see that it is difficult with this immediate heritage to put al-Shafi'i in some neat camp that makes him merely a duplicate of a later hanbalite far-right position. Unless we want some mirroring of the shi'ite stance that the bulk of his closest companions abandoned his way after his passing. On this point there are two brief contemporary articles that touch on these points: section III from Hallaq's, "Was al-Shafi'i the Master Architect of Islamic Jurisprudence?" and Melchert's, "The Adversaries of Ahmad ibn Hanbal."

Also, one must consider al-Shafi'i's antagonism yet involved disputations with Hafs al-Fard; a dual set of lessons - firstly that al-Shafi'i challenges the Mu'tazila on their own terms and can't be from them, but equally that he voluntarily enters into this type of challenge against them while still maintaining respect and long-term study with others like Abi Yahya. Note: The case of Abu Hanifa is also important here with respect to voluntary engagement with figures outside of the centre ground.

Lastly one will also have to weigh reports like what ibn Khallikan mentions under his entry on al-Shafi'i' that Ibn Hanbal forbade others from studying with him (i.e., ibn Ma'in) despite maintaining his admiration. Other reports among the traditionists that also discount him in hadith.

It seems that the only way to get a tidy account like that which gets produced in contemporary disputes and debates, pitting "sunni" theologians within a perfectly defined narrow "camp" of sunnism against their foes in a very orderly fashion is by rewriting actual history into a type of religious folklore. The reality is that these were all independent scholars, coming from different backgrounds, having studied with different teachers, living different lives under different challenges. All this gave rise to divergent views that have to be assessed with an intention towards accurately presenting their actual outlook - even if it hampers us from being able to construct an uber-rigid view of sunni orthodoxy. This requires some humility and justice when examining the historical sources that are available to us.

[On a tangent, the case of Hasan al-Basri is another case-study that can help to draw out all the same points. Also, in the later period, the work of Tabaqat al-Shafi'iyya by ibn al-Subki can be seen as a lesson in narrative construction - the refining of a madhab's self-perception as squarely Ash'ari.]

Allahu A'lam.

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> These are not ascriptions. Both Bayhaqi and Ibn 'Asakir quote with isnads, with explanation of his statements in light of all the reports.

It's not about possessing Isnads to the Imam. It's about how to interpret Imam al-Shafi`is creed. There are many Shafi`is who opposed Kalam and are Atharis.

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> How do you know the view of overwhelming laymen? If you want to make this claim then carry out a proper poll from a cross section of the Muslim communities. With the question, when experiencing Ru'yah of Allah will Allah be in a direction and will there be a specific distance between seer and seen?

There should be a poll, but the choice you are presenting them is very loaded. The choices you provide them forces them to adopt a position of affirmation or negation!

I argue that laymen - just like the Salaf and us - are silent are matters of negation/affirmation of Jihah and Muqabalah and Masafah. You failed the laymen of this Ummah when you obligated them to do the following:

> **They must believe in Ru'yah without tajsim, without tahdid, without jihah, without kayfiyyah...**

And whenever you have been confronted on the issue of laymen, you have dodged it. You say the laymen of today are not Hujjah (whatever that means), and then when asked whether laymen genuinely do in the belief of Ru'yah what Ash`aris do, you obligated them with the above. For you, silence from these innovated matters isn't good enough, and the Salaf from the Sahabah and Tabi`un simply didn't get the job done in clarifying this matter to the masses by remaining silent.

Harris Hammam:

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> Yes he does. He even quotes Qadi Abdul Jabbar (Mu'tazili) who said he has no disagreement with the Mujassimah, his disagreement is only with the Ash'aris!

QAJ didn't say he has no disagreement with the Mujassimah. He said the Ash`aris have no disagreement with the Mujassimah on Ru'yah. **فقد سبق أن نقلنا عن القاضي عبد الجبار قوله بأن الخلاف إنما هو مع الأشاعرة، حتى زعم أنه لا خلاف بينهم وبين المجسمة**

[Originally Posted by Hasan Saleem:]

> As for the Haqiqi disagreement, he says:
>
> وتحقيق المقام أن هناك مسألتين :
>
> الأولى: مفهوم الرؤية وشروطه، والخلاف بين الأشاعرة وبين غيرهم من المعتزلة ومن وافقهم حقيقي معنوي؛ لأن المعتزلة يزعمون استحالة الرؤية إلا بالحاسة والمقابلة والحدّ، والأشاعرة يقولون: إن الرؤية يمكن أن يوجدها الله تعالى مباشرة في النفس أو العين، فتدركها النفس ولو بلا توسط شعاع ولا كون المرئي محدودًا ومقابلاً.
>
> This is a difference on the ontology (external reality) of Ru'yah. For Mu'tazilah, Ru'yah is inconceivable without ordinary aspects of sight like opposition and so on. Ash'aris argue Ru'yah ontologically (in reality) is possible in this way. Ghazali has also explained what is the reality of Ru'yah and how it is possible without these things ordinarily associated with sight in the passage I quoted earlier. Fudah says the [/I]ikhtilaf is haqiqi from one aspect (the ontology of Ru'yah) and lafzi from another aspect (whatever is described as 'Ru'yah' in the texts will not be with hadd, jihah etc.). I believe this disagreement over the haqiqah of Ru'yah is an important and substantital one between us and Mu'tazilah, as for the latter this is not Ru'yah in the true sense, whereas for Sunnis, it is Ru'yah; and the result of the Mu'tazili view is, as Ghazali said, ta'til.

You didn't answer the question. Let me repeat:

**Do you agree with Sa`id Fudah's treatment of this issue,** in which he **clearly downplayed the difference** between the Ash`aris and Mu`tazilites, and **stated in multiple times the Khilaf in Ru'yah between the two positions is *by* in *large* Lafzi,** with **the net result being the same** [i.e., Ru'yah leads to more `ilm of Allah - according to Ash`aris it is via visual perception, according to Mu`tazilites it is the Ru'yah of the Qalb]?

A simple yes or no would suffice.

Hasan Saleem:

> It's not about possessing Isnads to the Imam. It's about how to interpret Imam al-Shafi`is creed. There are many Shafi`is who opposed Kalam and are Atharis.

We were talking about the use of Kalam. Readers can assess for themselves whether Bayhaqi and Ibn Asakir were unfair in their analysis of Imam al-Shafi'i's view on Kalam. Manaqib al-Shafi'i, volume 1, page 452 onwards – http://ia700408.us.archive.org/29/items/waqmnsh/01_mnsh.pdf & Tabyin Kadhib al-Muftari, p 250 onwards – https://ia700805.us.archive.org/15/items/Elkawthari/tabyinekazib.pdf

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> QAJ didn't say he has no disagreement with the Mujassimah. He saidthe Ash`aris have no disagreement with the Mujassimah on Ru'yah. فقد سبق أن نقلنا عن القاضي عبد الجبار قوله بأن الخلاف إنما هو مع الأشاعرة، حتى زعم أنه لا خلاف بينهم وبين المجسمة

Again you show a poor understanding of Arabic. QAJ said the disagreement is only with the Ash'aris (i.e. not with the Mujassimah); so the "hum" in la khlilafa baynahum refers to the

Mu'tazilah themselves. Meaning, both Mu'tazilah and Mujassimah are in agreement that there can be no Ru'yah without jihah, hadd, jism and so on.

[Originally Posted by Harris Hammam:]

> You didn't answer the question. Let me repeat:
>
> ***Do you agree with Sa`id Fudah's treatment of this issue,*** in which he clearly downplayed the difference between the Ash`aris and Mu`tazilites, and s***tated in multiple times the Khilaf in Ru'yah between the two positions is by in large Lafzi,*** with the ***net result being the same*** [i.e., Ru'yah leads to more `ilm of Allah - according to Ash`aris it is via visual perception, according to Mu`tazilites it is the Ru'yah of the Qalb]?
>
> A simple yes or no would suffice.

I have made my view quite clear, so I don't see the need to agree or disagree with what someone else is saying when there is no ambiguity in what I have already said. I have already mentioned Fudah believes there is a haqiqi difference between the Ash'aris and Mu'tazilah. If you would like me to answer this question, please quote the precise Fudah passage you are referring in its context, which you would like me to comment on. How can I answer with a yes or no, when I have not accepted what you are saying in the question?

APPENDICES

EXPOSING ISMAIL IBRAHIM'S POOR COMPREHENSION/DISHONESTY

Back in 2014, on the Islamic Awakening Forum, Ismail Ibrahim wrote:

"al-Bajuri said Kalam Nafsi should be kept under wraps and the public should not be exposed to it – his words are إلا في مقام التعليم. In other words, this fits in with the Ashari narrative that laymen are by nature anthropomorphists..."

And again:

"al-Bajuri ended up trying to keep this matter so hush-hush that he said this aspect of Asharism should be kept restricted to academic circles (إلا في مقام التعليم)."

In short, Ismail Ibrahim claimed:

1. Al-Bajuri said the concept of Kalam Nafsi should be kept hidden from the public

2. Al-Bajuri said discussion on Kalam Nafsi should be kept restricted to academic circles

Al-Bajuri said nothing of the sort.

In the passage of al-Bajuri in question, he was addressing the use of the statement: "The Qur'an is created". He explains that the word

"Qur'an" has two uses: the physical words of the Qur'an and the eternal non-verbal Kalam Nafsi. While the statement "the Qur'an is created" is correct according to the first usage, it is incorrect according to the second usage. Al-Bajuri thus argues that this statement should not be said (except in the context of teaching) because it might give the wrong impression that the eternal speech is created.

Al-Bajuri's passage is as follows:

ومذهب أهل السنة أن القرآن بمعنى الكلام النفسي ليس بمخلوق، وأما القرآن بمعنى اللفظ الذي نقرؤه فهو مخلوق، لكن يمتنع أن يقال: القرآن مخلوق ويراد به اللفظ الذي نقرؤه إلا في مقام التعليم لأنه ربما أوهم أن القرآن بمعنى كلامه تعالى مخلوق، ولذلك امتنعت الأئمة من القول بخلق القرآن

As one can see, al-Bajuri said nothing about keeping the concept of Kalam Nafsi under wraps or restricting it only to academic circles. These are false claims made by Ismail Ibrahim.

This is one clear example demonstrating Ismail Ibrahim's poor comprehension. To play his own game, we should also demand that if he does not retract the above claims he will be branded a liar.

Note, this is not the only example of Ismail Ibrahim's poor comprehension/dishonesty.

Here is another example:

Referring to the author of the book *Fawatih al-Rahamut*, Ismail Ibrahim said over seven years ago:

"He refers [to] some later extremist Ḥanafis in the other opinion (who said that it is not allowed) as Mutakallifeen who did Tashaddud."

By "it" Ismail Ibrahim meant for a person belonging to a madhhab to occasionally follow another madhhab i.e., madhhab-hopping.

Mufti Husain Kadodia said in refutation of him:

"This is either a lie from [Ismail Ibrahim] Patel or due to his terrible comprehension skills. وأحلاهما مر. The author was attacking those few partisan Hanafi's whose ta'assub reached the stage that they declared that if a Hanafi becomes a Shafi'i he should be punished (and not vice-versa). This is a terribly incorrect view, which was never a mainstream Hanafi one, Alhamdulillah. He was not attacking those who follow the mainstream Hanafi view of Madhab-hopping being impermissible."

MORE DISHONESTY FROM ISMAIL IBRAHIM/HARRIS HAMMAM

Someone commenting on Harris Hammam/Ismail Ibrahim's page said to him: "You spent years acting like an ass online with the comfort of hiding behind an online alias so that you could viciously denigrating Deobandis and their akaabir."

Ismail Ibrahim replied: "I'm not exposing the akabir lol. I use them frequently against your cult."

Ismail Ibrahim is trying to run away from his past, despite obsessively digging up "dirt" on his opponents.

Here is Ismail Ibrahim, writing as Harris Hammam:

"Deobandism is a creed and a self-contained sect within itself....It is exactly why M.KAS wrote al-Muhannad. It is exactly why many Deobandi elders have condemned Imam ibn Adbil Wahhab and Ibn Taymiyyah. It is exactly why the label of Deobandi is proudly adopted by millions amongst you worldwide."

"M.KAS" refers to Maulana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri.

And:

"I had a discussion with a Deo Mullah specialising in amulets in Bradford about this issue of Thanawi's popular Behishti Zewer. I confronted him with the Kufr propagated in the book, like

attaching verses to the thigh of the pregnant lady in labour...I said: "Whatever. But until I don't get an explicit fatwa from a reputable Darul Uloom that prohibits the sale of all prints of Behishti Zewar in the world, I will never believe your statement that these amulets are not from the works of Thanawi." He said: "Why do you need such a fatwa?" I said: "It is you who is ignorant. Why publish this book that contains evident Kufr in the name of Thanawi then?""

And:

"That should suffice for us in destroying two thirds of Deobandism, or at least one third. Those who wanna stick to Maturidism must drop both Mathabistic Taqleed and Sufism (two thirds of Deobandism dead for these guys); those wanna stick to Mathabistic Taqleed must drop Maturidism (one third of Deobandism dead for this group); and those who stick to Sufism the way it is understood by Deos must drop Maturidism (one third of Deobandism dead for these Khanqahis)."

And there's more where that came from.

Ismail Ibrahim engaged in denigrating Deobandis (as a whole) and their Akabir. His apparent denial of this is another example of his dishonesty.

ISMAIL IBRAHIM FABRICATING A FALSE NARRATIVE BASED ON A COMPLETE MISREADING

About ten years ago, a collection of Arabic articles written by Mufti Taqi Usmani was compiled and published. In one of these articles, Mufti Taqi Usmani wrote:

"It is necessary for male and female students to have separate schools and for females to not study in male schools. There are many harms in boys and girls having the same school. **One is that the intermingling of males and females opposes the Islāmic Sharī'ah**. Another is that this intermingling corrupts the character and tempts youngsters. Another is that it affects the students' attention towards their studies. Another is that Allāh has created men and women for different purposes, hence their topics of study should be different, as we will explain if Allāh wills. Mixed schools are nothing but an unadulterated imitation of the West. The harms that have become prevalent as a result are evident to the person of insight. Hence, it is necessary for the Islāmic world to be vigilant about it." (*Maqālāt al-'Uthmānī*, 1:381)

Of course, the shameless normalisers of men and women intermingling are irked by this articulation of the Sharī'ah's clear stance prohibiting it. Hence, Ismail Ibrahim, one of their numbers, tries to undermine this by claiming:

"The maqalah in question was written by Mufti Taqi in 1969. Mufti Taqi was 26 YEARS OLD in 1969. This is when idealism was given preference over pragmatism...There was no Bangladesh. Pakistan was under secular rule with Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan, and still finding its religious feet. Mufti Taqi himself has obviously moved on from these maqalat. Look at his actions..."

He repeats the same claim that it was written in 1969 a couple more times. Yet, the introductory page to the article (*Maqālāt al-ʿUthmānī*, 1:348) explicitly states it was originally written in 1976 and later revised in 2012 for the publication of his Arabic articles. Thus, not only was the article originally written in 1976, not 1969 as falsely claimed by Ismail Ibrahim, but the version in the book is an updated one, revised by Mufti Taqi Usmani himself in 2012! Repeating the claim of it being written in 1969, along with the extrapolations drawn from this falsehood, reflects only the brazen shamelessness of Ismail Ibrahim. Notice he says "there was no Bangladesh" i.e., in 1969, yet in this very article of Mufti Taqi Usmani he refers to "Bangladesh"! (*Maqālāt al-ʿUthmānī*, 1:384)

Ismail Ibrahim likely got the 1969 date from the last page of the article, which mentions the year 1389 AH (1969 CE), and he jumped to the false conclusion that this is when the article was written, even though the date refers to something else and not to the date of writing the article in question. (*Maqālāt al-ʿUthmānī*, 1:385) Ismail Ibrahim was always known for his poor comprehension, but one would have thought that with advancing age, he would at least refrain from putting it on such brazen display.

وقد وُفِّقت جامعةُ الملك عبدِ العزيز فى مكّة المكرّمة لعقد مُؤتمرٍ حاشدٍ على هذا الموضوع باسم "المؤتمر العالميّ الأوّل للتّعليم الإسلاميّ"، فى سنة١٩٧٦م وكان مُؤتمرًا مشهودا قد حضره كبارُ أهل الفكر والعلم من مشارق الأرض ومغاربها، وإنّى كتبت لذلك المؤتمر هذه المقالةَ الّتى تحدّثتُ فيها عن التّعليم الدّينيّ فى باكستان، ومدى قبولِه للإصلاح فى نظامِه ومَنْهَجِه.

والحمد لله تعالى على أنّ هذه المقالةَ قد حازت قبولًا وثناءً من قِبَل أهل العلم والفكر فى العالَم العربيّ والإسلاميّ، وقد نشرت من مكتبة دارالعلوم بكراتشى سنة ١٣٩٩من الهجرة ، ولما أريد نشرها مرّةً أخرىٰ فى مجموعة مقالاتى العربيّة، وجدتُّ أنّ المعلوماتِ الكثيرةَ من المدارس الدينيّة صارت قديمة، وتحتاج إلى إعادة النّظر للظُّروف المتغيِّرة ، فأعدتُّ فيها النظرَ وضمّنتها المعلومات الجديدةَ وحذفت منها أشياء لا داعي إليها نظراً إلى هذه الظروف. وأسأل الله سبحانه أن يجعلها خالصة لوجهه الكريم وينفع بها المسلمين ، وينفعنى بها فى الآخرة ، وما توفيقى إلا بالله العليّ العظيم.

محمد تقي العثمانيّ
نائب مدير دار العلوم كراتشى ١٤
١٤٣٣/٧/١هـ

وإن هذه المقترحات جميعا مأخوذة من توصية مجلس لعلماء باكستان، قد انعقد في كراتشي سنة ١٣٨٩هـ وقد نشرت هذه التوصية في مجلة "البلاغ" الشهرية عدد جمادى الثانية سنة ١٣٨٩هـ ص ٣٢٣ إلى ٣٤١ ج٣.

وآخر دعوانا أن الحمد لله رب العالمين.